

142002

L. Skvortsov

**THE
IDEOLOGY
AND
TACTICS
OF
ANTI-COMMUNISM**

L. Skvortsov

**THE
IDEOLOGY
AND
TACTICS
OF
ANTI-COMMUNISM**

(Myths and Reality)



PROGRESS PUBLISHERS
MOSCOW

TRANSLATED FROM THE RUSSIAN BY J. TURNER
DESIGNED BY L. MAKAROVA

Л. Скворцов

ИДЕОЛОГИЯ И ТАКТИКА
АНТИКОМУНИЗМА

На английском языке

THE LIBRARY

Southwest Texas State University

San Marcos, Texas

CONTENTS

Page

BOURGEOIS IDEOLOGY AT THE CROSSROADS

How Ideology Died?	9
Anti-communism Instead of Democracy	14
The "Twisted Mind"	30

WHERE IS MANKIND GOING?

Rejection of Social and Intellectual Progress	37
A Pessimistic View of the Future of Mankind	40
Is There a Way Out?	47

THE STRATEGY AND TACTICS OF ANTI-COMMUNISM

Anti-communism—the Road to Fascism	55
"The Global Way of Thinking"	68
The Aims and Tactics of Propaganda	74
Anti-communism as a System of Education	81

THE FUTILE "CRUSADE"

The "Self-criticism" of Anti-communism	86
A Reassessment of Tactics?	98

INSTEAD OF A CONCLUSION	104
-----------------------------------	-----

First printing 1969

In recent years imperialism has considerably intensified its ideological diversions as a necessary preliminary to aggressive action. Using armed force and exporting counter-revolution it attempts to turn back the wheel of history, to smother the flame of revolutionary struggle in Asia, Africa and Latin America, to wage an attack on the working class and the forces of democracy in capitalist countries and to sap the strength of the socialist world.

Imperialism wants to weld together all reactionary forces under the ideological banner of anti-communism. During preparations for the Second World War, anti-communism paved the political and ideological way for the emergence of nazism. The appearance of fascist regimes in a number of countries was accompanied by a wave of anti-communist hysteria combined with the unpremeditated gamble on the anti-capitalist mood of the masses and the nationalist sentiments among the petty bourgeoisie. In this way imperialist ideology gained a wide social base.

The defeat of the nazi armed forces by the Soviet army, in alliance with all democratic forces led to the collapse of the social and political system of fascism and thereby undetermined the influence of its ideology.

However, imperialism survived and so did the basis on which anti-communism is built. In the post-war period, imperialist forces began to step up their output of anti-communist propaganda. At the same time, they were faced with the problem of inventing new forms of social demagoguery and ways of ideologically mystifying the people at large. This rise in anti-communist propaganda went hand in hand with a move to hoodwink the people in capitalist countries with a heap of misrepresentations into accepting the cold war and the anti-communist hysteria which imperialism was fomenting.

One of the strategic aims of bourgeois propaganda is to present anti-communism as a political platform of struggle for "freedom and 'democracy'". With this in mind bourgeois propagandists ply the people of capitalist countries with the notion that the communist movement is "anti-democratic and that the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are 'aggressive'". Bourgeois propaganda and numerous ideological operations undertaken after the war have all been subordinated to this aim.

One of the vital questions facing modern anti-communist propaganda is how to induce and spread illusions. Bourgeois propagandists have resolved and are resolving the problem today, but in the final issue the question goes even deeper—how to create a whole system of illusory notions, a kind of "twisted mind", which, when moulded, would turn the population of capitalist countries into a willing pawn in the political game imperialism is playing.

No matter how paradoxical this may seem, anti-communism based its whole brainwashing process on the political apathy among certain strata of the population—a mood nurtured by the imperialist ideologists after the war. This mood formed the breeding ground for a whole assortment of illusions which created the proper psychological conditions for the mushrooming of neofascist organisations and the initiation of aggressive adventurist policy.

The rebirth of fascism is an alarming fact over which we should keep a watchful eye, as the aims of neofascist organisations in their starkest, most extreme form reflect the political strivings of aggressive imperialist groups in such major capitalist countries as the U.S.A. and West Germany.

The spreading of political apathy in the West posed the question in bourgeois sociological literature as to whether ideology can exist at all. It is worthwhile discussing the question from a Marxist standpoint as it enables us to trace the formative process of anti-communist illusions, the mechanics of bourgeois propaganda and to correlate anti-communist myths with reality.

I. BOURGEOIS IDEOLOGY AT THE CROSSROADS

Has Ideology Died?

Since the Second World War the issue of the so-called "end of ideology" has been more and more hotly debated in bourgeois philosophical and sociological literature. It has been raised in various connections by Daniel Bell, Seymour Lipset, Raymond Aron and many other eminent bourgeois sociologists. Bourgeois sociologists and philosophers conclude that ideology is an "artificial formation" which in the West is replaced by "value compromise", a pragmatic approach to reality. In the socialist countries ideology continues to exist as an "artificial formation" incompatible with the present-day development of "industrial society". This is a fairly widespread view and before evaluating it in general terms, we must clearly see the reasons behind it.

Modern history tested the ideologies which began to mature in the 19th century and reached full stature in the 20th. As we know, the second half of the 19th century gave birth to Nietzschean philosophy, which decidedly influenced fascist ideology. We must not shut our eyes to the fact that the fascists have managed to poison the outlook of fairly wide sections of the lower middle class in some capitalist countries with nationalistic, chauvinistic and racist ideas. Fascist regimes in a number of countries enabled

the nazi leaders to boast that they would succeed in creating the "millennial kingdom".

The nazis cynically regarded the masses as the "raw material", deprived of independence and intelligence, for political experimentation. Nazism supposed that it could foist the idea on to some people that they belonged to a special élite and on to others that they were doomed to servility. To turn preaching into practice the boom of Goebbels's propaganda machine was inadequate and only the SS squads and the gas ovens of Auschwitz and Maidanek were able to enforce the "new" ideas.

The spearhead of nazi ideology and terrorism was aimed at communist ideology, Communist and Workers' Parties and all the forces of democracy, and its policy culminated in the aggressive predatory war against the Soviet Union. The Second World War pivoted on a mortal combat between reactionary nazi and progressive forces, the stronghold of which is the Soviet Union. The war exploded the myth of nazi "socialism" and highlighted its barbarous imperialist facets. Fascism as an ideological system, in its concentrated and starkest form, signposted the modern imperialist path to unbridled reaction.

Fascism depended on carefully planned, large-scale propagation of reactionary ideology, and the brainwashing of the lower middle classes into an anti-communist and anti-democratic fervour, thus distorting their whole outlook. The fascists formulated the "ideology of the crowd" insistently stamping out the class consciousness of the masses and prevented them from understanding their real social interests by misrepresentation and the propagandist methods of "big lies".

The social and political practice of fascism over two decades has proved its inhumanity, adventurism and antagonism to the people's interests and ultimately its political impotence.

The collapse of fascism gave birth to a negative attitude to imperialist propaganda and expansionist militarist ideology among the bulk of the masses when they began to realise the serious social threat which it presented. In the post-war period this natural reaction of the masses was used by bourgeois propagandists to turn the people's distrust of imperialist propaganda and policy into a hostile attitude to any ideology, to inculcate political apathy and indifference to the class struggle and Marxist-Leninist philosophy and in the final issue to resurrect anti-communism and reaction.

Bourgeois sociologists have asserted that ideology is dead. This, however, is only an intermediary phase in the process of achieving the political aims of modern imperialist propaganda. At the same time these assertions reflect deeper-rooted phenomena, i.e., the crisis of bourgeois ideology brought about by the course of world history, the increased impact of socialism and its ideas, the downfall of the imperialist colonial system and the development of the revolutionary movement throughout the world. Beginning with the Paris Commune, when the proletariat first, although temporarily, rose to power, the natural historical process of social development has been characterised by a constant advance of the working-class movement and the forces of socialism and a decline of the forces of capitalism and reaction. Marxists consider and evaluate modern social phenomena in this wide historical perspective, enabling them to see the

most deep-rooted social laws in action. This is therefore, the only correct and scientific approach as modern social life cannot be understood correctly in isolation from past history.

A different approach to the evaluation of basic facts concerning the evolution and crisis of bourgeois ideology is to be found in non-Marxist philosophical and sociological thought. As a rule, it analyses imperialist ideology within separate, narrowly defined historical stages with no indication of its general tendencies and laws of development. This approach, whether adopted consciously or unconsciously, is apologetic and does not expose the reactionary role of modern imperialist ideology and its contradiction to global historical progress.

It is wrong to think that the collapse of fascism meant the disappearance of bourgeois ideology. The death of fascism has helped to dig the grave of one of the forms of bourgeois ideology in the age of imperialism, an ideology which expressed the interests of the most militarist and chauvinist elements of finance capital. However too obvious is the fact that fascism, by nature bourgeois, had a number of features generally typical of contemporary bourgeois ideology, and its collapse undermined bourgeois ideology in one of its historical forms, though many of its features have survived until today.

When the wide social basis, on which modern bourgeois ideology rested during the bourgeois revolution, crumbled, it was forced to adapt itself to the psychology and consciousness of the masses, particularly that of the lower middle classes. It is not for nothing that the fascists have couched their anti-communism and racism in quasi-socialist phraseology.

After the war a tendency to give imperialist ideology a semblance of democracy became noticeable.

In capitalist countries after the Second World War, the ideas of democracy, freedom of speech, the press, demonstration and the existence of various political parties influenced wide sections of the common people antagonistic to fascism. When the membership of Communist Parties, especially in European and Asiatic countries, swelled and Marxist-Leninist philosophy became the basic spiritual force opposing fascism, exploitation and colonialism, political democracy and the freedom of expression exercised by the working people and the oppressed nations of the world became a serious threat to the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Many major political events pointed to the fact that Europe would ultimately get out on the road to socialism when democracy widened and advanced. The defeat of fascism in Europe undermined the political hegemony of the bourgeoisie, based on open totalitarian dictatorship, and weakened imperialism in colonial and dependent countries. The liberation movement in the colonial and dependent countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America was guided by communists and democrats who led the struggle for national liberation, democracy and socialism. The political dominance of the imperialist bourgeoisie in the major capitalist countries was thereby severely jeopardised.

As we know, the bourgeoisie in imperialist countries, particularly the U.S.A. have taken economic, political and military steps, designed to hamper the development of democracy and socialism. The creation of aggressive military forces, the setting up of military bases on foreign

territory, "economic aid" to Europe by the Marshall Plan, the revision of democratic electoral systems, the sending of expeditionary forces to suppress national liberation movements, victimisation of Communist Parties, the rebirth of German militarism, political support of fascist dictators remaining after the Second World War in Spain and Portugal and despotisms in Latin America—this is a far from comprehensive list of economic and political measures aimed at immobilising democracy.

These measures could not stop the onward march of history. Despite all imperialist efforts the old colonial system has collapsed and the socialist community, which a number of European and Asian countries have joined, has been welded into an unbreakable unit. Along with this the Communist Parties in capitalist countries are supported by millions of working people, although we should not forget that imperialists have succeeded in slowing down the advance of democracy in their countries and in part to adapt it to the will of the ruling élite. To this end democracy is attacked under cover of such formulas as the "defence" of democracy and freedom in the struggle against communism.

Anti-communism Instead of Democracy

After the Second World War bourgeois ideologists began to preach militarism and aggression in the name of defending the so-called "free world". The "free world" meant a group of imperialist countries, capitalist states dependent on them and the left-overs of the collapsing colonial system.

Imperialist propaganda advertised all its tight-fisted concessions to the forces of democracy as national liberation as the voluntary "grantin

of freedom to peoples. It tried to paint the socialist world, particularly the Soviet Union, as an "aggressive" force which threatened the peoples of capitalist countries.

The campaign to protect the so-called "free world" was now waged openly and aggressively against the socialist community. Political forces of all shapes and sizes joined together in this anti-communist drive. The congress of bourgeois ideologists on the theme *The Future of Freedom* held in Milan in 1955, was exemplary of this. Some 150 bourgeois ideologists and politicians took part in the congress, including men ranging in opinions from Right to "Left"-wing groups: Hugh Gaitskell and Richard Crossman (Labour), Michael Polanyi and Colin Clark (Conservative), Arthur Schlesinger (Americans for Democratic Action), Friedrich Hayek (Conservative), André Philip (Socialist) and other representatives. Despite the fact that representatives of various political parties met at the congress the only occasions on which debate grew warm were, as one of the participants noted, "when someone served as a 'surrogate Communist' by saying something which could be defined as being too favourable to Russia".¹

This unanimity, surprising in view of the diversity of political parties, struck the Conservative Professor F. Hayek as politically dangerous since it posed the question of whether freedom of speech in the "free world" was a reality. In this connection Professor Hayek attacked the delegates for preparing "to bury freedom instead of saving it".²

¹ S. M. Lipset, *Political Man*, New York, 1963, p. 440.

² *Ibid.*

The main ideological aim of bourgeois propaganda initially was to undermine in capitalist countries sympathy for the Soviet Union and the Soviet people, who bore the brunt of the war against nazi Germany. It also sought to weaken the popularity of communist founders and leaders of the resistance movement against fascism. The strategic aim of bourgeois ideologists was to sap the strength of the social base of the communist movement and then to crush it by political repressions.

After the war the bourgeoisie in the major capitalist countries were unable to formulate in an undisguised form their selfish interests, which meant the wiping out of democratic liberties, suppression of anti-colonial and national liberation movements and opposition to the socialist camp. Had they voiced their ideas openly, the ruling groups would have been isolated. Therefore it was initially thought necessary to prepare the ground for open attack by psychologically moulding large sections of the population in the spirit of anti-communism.

In order to achieve this, bourgeois politicians applied all their efforts to spreading and supporting *political apathy* among the masses. The distinctive feature of ideological life in the major imperialist countries after the Second World War was that on the radio, television and in the press no single set ideological doctrine was fed to the masses as had been the custom during fascist dictatorships. This gave the impression that the press and radio broadcasts were "objective", that there was no "propaganda" and that any pressure, which had formerly been brought to bear on the masses, had now disap-

peared. This was exactly the effect bourgeois leaders were trying to achieve.

At the same time they made much use of so-called "mass culture", characteristic of Western ideological life today. I repeat, *ideological* life. It would be wrong to regard series of nudist films, horror films, comics, mass edition of illustrated pornographic magazines, the sale of pornographic postcards and striptease—typical examples of modern mass bourgeois "culture"—as mere entertainment helping people to enjoy their free time. The flood of "mass culture" was used to brainwash the *masses*. The television, public house and cinema attracted common people and made them spiritually bankrupt.

A definite type of person valuing most of all "cash", powerful sensations and game for anything as long as he could live a "life of ease" was thereby created in capitalist countries. For this man the "free world" means money and striptease and as soon as this is in plentiful supply, his political and moral principles are null and void. For him any political principles are meaningless "propaganda". It is this man whom bourgeois propaganda has declared "free" in every respect under "real democracy".

Bourgeois sociological and political literature after the war has been insistently adhering to the idea that real democracy should not be reached directly in political action. The well-known American sociologist and associate professor in the department of government at Cornell University, Andrew Hacker, in his article "What Kind of Nation Are We?" published in *The New York Times Magazine*, reasons in the following way: "We are, first and foremost, a democracy. Indeed, of all the major countries of the world

we are probably the most democratic in feeling and actions. *To be sure, the will of the majority is not reflected in many of our political institutions* [my italics.—L.S.]. In the Congress, in state legislatures and in a thousand city halls and country court-houses, well-entrenched minoritic have their way. But this is partly because there is no coherent and continuing majority; and even if there were, it is not clear that this aggregation would have a 'will' demanding to be translated into legislation.

"Perhaps this is only another way of saying that America is not really a political nation. For most of us, affairs of state come well down in our list of personal concerns."¹

In this quotation there are two crucial points typical of bourgeois ideology after the war. First the will of the people and of the majority is regarded by bourgeois ideologists as a myth which "realistic" politicians have long since discarded. Second, it is believed that the democracy of thought and action is most easily expressed in solving problems connected with everyday worries, whereas important political and state problems slip into the background for the ordinary man in capitalist society today.

Bourgeois ideologists apologetically make out that this result evolved naturally as a product of real democracy. In reality, however, the divorce of political power from the will of the people reflects the degeneration of democracy, its negation.

Bourgeois ideologists try to pass off the emasculation of democracy as the result of "solving

¹ *The New York Times Magazine*, December 8, 1963, p. 23.

the basic political problems in capitalist countries. This supposedly means that heated political discussions and the sharpness of class conflict do not exist, and politics itself becomes a tedious affair amounting to securing a few more privileges amid general prosperity. Similar arguments are frequently brandished by American sociologists. Professor Seymour Lipset, for instance, writes: "This change in Western political life reflects the fact that the fundamental political problems of the industrial revolution have been solved."¹ He goes on: "The democratic class struggle will continue, but it will be a fight without ideologies, without red flags, without May Day parades."²

Is it really true that politics and ideological class distinctions are disappearing in the capitalist West? On the contrary, political contradictions in bourgeois countries are mounting. Even in the most developed capitalist countries such as the U.S.A. political issues, for instance the Negro problem, have become acute as never before. At the same time the people's will is not represented as it ought to be in the politics of state institutions and the press.

In New York and other American cities the passer-by may find leaflets protesting against illegal action on the part of the police, its cruelty, etc. The murder of two Puerto-Ricans, Maximo Solero and Victor Rodriguez, was reported in the press in November 1963. The press interpreted the facts in such a way that it seemed as if Solero and Rodriguez had been killed during a clash with the police. However, there

¹ S. M. Lipset, *Political Man*, N. Y., 1963, p. 442.

² *Ibid.* p. 445.

were sufficient grounds to assume premeditated murder. The policemen arrested Solero and Rodriguez on the street, put them in a car and took them into a dark tunnel where they were shot. Of course, the authorities believed the testimonies of the policemen without a public enquiry into all the circumstances of the murder. The leaflet issued on this point demanded an open enquiry into this case and the organisation of a protest demonstration to show that this was not the first time the police shot first and refused to answer any questions.

Directly before the Negro unrest in New York in the summer of 1964, there were instances that in clashes between Negroes and whites, the police turned against the Negroes without going into the reasons for the clashes.

Facts of this kind can only be correctly understood within the context of mounting antagonisms in the U.S.A. arising from racial discrimination, the suppression of national minorities, and the use of terrorism to quell any large-scale organised protest by oppressed social groups.

As we know, this led to open armed clashes between Negroes and the police in Los Angeles in 1965, where, in fact, the federal government was waging an actual war against the insurgent Negroes living in the slums of Watts.

Even today this political battle is not dying down, on the contrary, it is raging more fiercely and spreading to more and more towns and regions in the north and south of the country. Bourgeois society has been unable to give a satisfactory answer to the Negro issue within the existing social system, and that is why objec-

tively it is necessary to go beyond the limits of this system to grapple with the problem.

The agrarian question is no less acute with the disappearance of small farms, the formation of a nomadic army of farm labourers, grim labour conditions, the illegal use of child labour on farms, etc.

There is still no end of industrial problems to be faced in the U.S.A.: towns and villages dying out in coal-mining regions, the threat of increased unemployment through automation, the education and technical training of young people inconsistent with the demands of the employing firm—all these are actual and potential grounds for the aggravation of the political and, therefore, the ideological conflict in the U.S.A. Bourgeois sociologists' conclusions that the class struggle, "if it continues", will be an ideology-free struggle, will never live up to reality.

This "anti-ideological" trend is also anti-communist. It is a new, and original attempt to deprive the masses of their class consciousness and to turn them into an amorphous crowd which could be soft-soaped by the reactionary ideological aims of modern imperialism.

Individualism and the political apathy, which is part and parcel of it, have become widespread among certain sections of the population in capitalist countries. Results obtained in surveys among representatives of student organisations in the major American universities are symptomatic of this. During the 1963 pre-election campaign *The New York Times Magazine* asked the editors of university newspapers about the political views and inclinations of the student body. Harvard University (Boston), City College (New York), Indiana University (Bloomington), the

State University of Iowa, Stanford University and other educational establishments geographically situated in the east, middle west and west of the country, were selected as objects of research. The general opinion of student organisation representatives was that the majority of American students were primarily beset with personal worries and were little concerned about the crucial political problems which formed only the background to their everyday worries. Joseph Rassin, the Harvard representative, stated that "individualism is more than a philosophy in Cambridge: it is the dominant religion".¹ Robert Rosenblatt, the City College representative, summed up the prevalent attitude among students of today as follows: "Unlike their predecessors of 15 years ago, who were absorbed in sports, or the undergraduates of the nineteen-thirties, who were caught up in the turmoil of social problems, today's City College students are deeply involved in finding a personal niche in an uncertain world."²

This individualism, which has affected many American students, is bound up with liberal moods. These, however, are insufficiently militant and are not clearly formulated as organisational principles. When one student was asked what was his attitude to the problem of civil rights, he said: "Sure, I'm interested in civil rights, but I can't give my life to it."³

However, student opposition to ultra Right-wing, neo-Nazi ideology must not be underestimated. The influence of McCarthyism and Goldwa-

¹ *The New York Times Magazine*, November 17, 1963.

p. 24.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

terism among American students has been negligible.

Active followers of ultra Right-wing policy in universities usually amount to small groups of a few dozen people, whereas the majority of students are virulently antagonistic to it. The majority of American students support the ideas of the civil rights and CND movements. They actively protest against the aggressive imperialist policy of the U.S.A. in Vietnam and other countries where American militarism tries to use brute force to crush the people's struggle for national liberation. At a press conference on October 20th, 1965 Paul Bus, the National Secretary of the *Students for a Democratic Society* organisation gave a clear résumé of these views. He said that almost every person of his age would prefer to build and not to burn, to teach and not to torment, to help and not to kill if he had the right to choose. Paul Bus sent a telegram to President Johnson and Nicholas Katzenbach, the Attorney General, which said that instead of taking part in the war in Vietnam they were ready to work and die for freedom as their generation in Mississippi and Alabama did.

The ruling élite in imperialist states not only supports political apathy but has set up a special machinery to select people incapable of independent thinking to carry out executive functions.

The American sociologist, William Whyte, introduced the term "organisation man" to denote the expanding social group in capitalist countries which does not take a direct part in material production and makes no important economic and political decisions, but rather executes the decisions of the ruling class.

These yes-men are forced to lose their individuality and learn the habit of quickly and accurately carrying out the functions entrusted to them. They become cogs in the organisational "above" them which regulates the whole of their behaviour. Their political views are not personal convictions but a sum total of "reflexes" without which the organisation could neither exist nor function. William Whyte characterises the way of life of the "organisation man" in the following way: "There are only a few times in organisation life when he can wrench his destiny into his own hands—and if he does not fight then, he will make a surrender that will later mock him."¹

In what way did capitalism breed a stratum of people who gradually lose their personal convictions and become cogs in a huge organisational machine? Two methods were used to achieve this aim. First, under the direct influence of business the system of higher education was re-constructed. For instance, in the U.S.A., particularly after the war, there was a sharp cut in the number of students studying theoretical subjects particularly history, economics, philosophy and languages and, at the same time, a considerable increase in the number of students studying applied subjects, particularly business. It is enough to say that from 1940 to 1950 the number of students studying business doubled. By 1955 their number was greater than the total number of students studying mathematics, the natural physical and biological sciences and English.

¹ William H. Whyte, *The Organisation Man*, New York, 1957, p. 15.

Second, capitalist countries widely use the system of employment tests. The aim of these tests is to X-ray every employee psychologically and ideologically and to check his potential loyalty or lack of it. Figures themselves will speak for the growing use of these tests: in the U.S.A. in 1952 one-third of all corporations used tests and by 1954 this figure had reached 60 per cent. At the present time special kinds of tests and workers' registration cards have been devised, where, together with finger prints, general information about each worker is entered. The system of checking loyalty is not only widely used in monopoly concerns but to an even greater extent in the state apparatus, educational and scientific establishments and in social institutions.

The ruling class of modern imperialist states is keenly interested in the psychological and ideological training of personnel in the state machinery and the administration of monopolies simply because the bureaucratic apparatus is playing an ever increasing part in the political life of capitalist countries. Many political issues which in the heyday of bourgeois democracy were hotly debated in parliament, are now being more and more often decided directly by the bureaucracy without preliminary discussion. This concentration of democratic forms of government is often supported by bourgeois ideologists, who insistently emphasise the greater "competence" of the bureaucratic apparatus as compared with the legislative assembly. They prove that the modern bourgeois state which has to deal with concrete political, military, economic and other questions has inevitably to have recourse to "specialists", who know all the ins and outs of

these problems and the technique of solving them, whereas members of parliament have too general and often inadequate knowledge to solve them. This argument is, in fact, a justification of the divorce of the bureaucratic apparatus from parliament and creates condition for the uncontrolled domination of society by bureaucrats.

This situation is particularly dangerous in that it leaves its imprint on the solution of a vital issue determining the destiny and interests of whole peoples—the issue of war and peace.

Modern imperialist states, as they develop, are dispensing with bourgeois democracy. This trend which Lenin noted at the beginning of the century, is starkly visible at the present time.

Some bourgeois politicians themselves occasionally admit that the administrative-bureaucratic and military-industrial apparatus have been vested with considerably more powers, but they neither reveal the real reasons for this increase nor its social consequences. In reality, these processes are organically bound up with and result directly from the tendency of imperialism to political reaction in all directions.

Modern bourgeois sociologists often eulogise the state systems in capitalist countries as a "model" for implementing the principles proclaimed by the 17th and 18th century bourgeois revolutions. The U.S.A., which has left its constitution practically unchanged since the end of the 18th century, deserves special mention. D. W. Brogan, American bourgeois political researcher, writes: "The American Constitution is the oldest written constitution in existence . . . Forms and realities have changed less in

the United States than in any other political organisation, even than in Tibet."¹

However, it must be remembered that although the old constitution of the U.S.A. has been formally preserved, an essential change in the political structure has taken place and a glaring discrepancy between the principles proclaimed by the bourgeois revolution and contemporary political reality has developed.

The bourgeois revolutions proclaimed the equality of all people from birth, and accordingly, their equal political rights. This principle seen against the U.S.A.'s open racial discrimination is nothing but an abstraction at variance with reality. The American constitution allows freedom of the press and accords every citizen the formal right of freedom of speech, but what remains of this when practically the whole press, radio and television are concentrated in the hands of monopolies.

The American Constitution recognises first and foremost the people's sovereignty. According to the letter and spirit of the American Constitution, the people ought to be ruling the country. How to apply this abstraction to contemporary American reality is the real problem. Is it correct to assume that in as far as the President and Congress are elected by the people, the people rule through their representatives? This could be contended if the electoral machine itself actually expressed the will and interests of the American people. Yet the existing bourgeois electoral systems in capitalist countries are adjusted to represent the will of the ruling class ca-

¹ D. W. Brogan, *Politics in America*, New York, 1954, p. 1.

mouflaged as the will of the national majority. Today, any presidential candidate cannot hope to win without a well-organised and expensive pre-election campaign invariably entailing expensive radio and television self-advertisement election leaflets, election tours, banquets and public speeches. Direct bribery and black mail of the electorate is a legitimate part of all this.

Hence the people can only choose their congressmen and presidents from the candidates whose activity is controlled and organised by big capital.

The modern system of bourgeois parties also serves to contort the people's will. For instance in the U.S.A. the system has been evolved by which the country's whole political life is monopolised by two bourgeois parties but, at the present time, the differences between them are negligible as their policies are equally controlled by monopoly capital.

When he came to power, President Johnson elected from the Democratic Party, began to pursue the aggressive policy of the Republican Barry Goldwater which had already proved it unpopular during the pre-election campaign. Playing with the electorate's will and ignoring the glaring discrepancy between actual policy and pre-election slogans, cloaked in the demagogic promises to build the "great society" in the U.S.A. are inalienable features of the two-party system. The distinctive feature of the two-party system is that it caters for a semblance of democracy while considerably limiting it. It enables anti-capitalist political groups which express the will and interests of the workers and the exploited masses to be removed from the political

arena and allows a country's political life to be monopolised while formally preserving democratic institutions. Modern political life is full of examples of these new forms of imperialist domination which occasionally steers clear of open terrorist dictatorships preferring to achieve its ends by camouflaging its real aims by democratic forms. But this does not rule out acts of open terrorism.

The experience of American capitalism is being gradually adopted by European bourgeois parties seeking to remove communists from the political arena. They are playing a subtle political game in opposition which seeks to protect the strongholds of capitalism as zealously as the political parties in power do.

The age of imperialism is characterised by the brazen affirmation of precisely those forms of political activity of bourgeois parties which have resulted in the degeneration of political democracy and its substitution by a machinery turning the will of the people into the will of the ruling capitalist minority. In one way or another, this fact is recognised by some bourgeois researchers who justify it by references to the "particular mission" of, and the "particular respect" felt by all society for, big business. For instance, D. W. Brogan, analysing the political history of the U.S.A., from the moment imperialism was born right up to the beginning of the 30s writes: "It is true that for the great part of modern American history, from the end of the Civil War to 1932, the American businessman not only regarded himself, but was regarded by the mass of the Americans, as *the* representative man whose judgement was to be respected and whose leadership, normally, was to be accept-

ed."¹ Thus, even bourgeois researchers recognise that the modern bourgeois state machinery is the champion, not of the people's will, but of the will of an insignificant capitalist minority ruling by economic manipulation.

The "Twisted Mind"

The modern political system in imperialist countries enables the masses to be plied with a heap of illusions, the sum total of which produces a kind of "twisted mind". In the age of imperialism this "twisted mind" is not only the elemental product of capitalist social relations but the result of organised spiritual pressure on the masses, who are systematically subjected to opinions at variance with reality and fundamentally contrary to their interests. In capitalist countries today, the masses are manipulated in flexible, methodical ways, which take into account their psychology and their prevalent moods at any given historical stage. The press, radio and television are deployed for these purposes.

The general aim pursued is to mould some sections of the people psychologically in such a way that they begin to identify their interests and aims with the political aims of bourgeois parties. Imperialist propaganda tries to produce the "value synthesis" in various classes on the basis of a bourgeois ideology. Those so treated are induced to react positively to the ruling class and identify themselves with it in their minds. In the capitalist countries where Communist and Workers' Parties are politically stable, deviations of class consciousness of this type are possible but always negligible. On the other hand, in the capitalist countries where the bour-

geoisie has managed to hound the Communist parties underground and weaken their influence, using persecution and repression, the scale of political illusions has become a force to be reckoned with. In the U.S.A., for instance, political illusions are very widespread among some sections of the working class where it is commonly believed that the Democratic Party represents in general the interests of the workers as distinct from the Republican Party which expresses the interests of business. In this way, some American bourgeois sociologists attempt to put forward the Democratic Party as the "working-class party" of the U.S.A.

Bourgeois sociologists use the "twisted mind" to evaluate incorrectly the crucial historical events of recent times. Typical in this respect are attempts to present the change of political power from one bourgeois party to the next as "non-violent revolutions" supposedly keeping big capital away from power. Illusions of this kind are common when reformist and social-democratic parties in Europe come to power. Similar illusions are diffused in the U.S.A., too. For instance, President Roosevelt's appearance at the political helm and "the new deal" which he proclaimed are interpreted by some bourgeois sociologists as a "non-violent revolution" which forced big business to take up defensive positions.¹

Of course, at a period in history when capitalism goes through a deep socio-political crisis and the working class rises to active political struggle, big capital adopts defensive tactics and the reformist parties move into the centre of the

¹ D. W. Brogan, *op. cit.*, p. 313.

¹ See D. W. Brogan, *Politics in America*, p. 313.

political arena with their programmes of half-measures, demanding certain concessions to the working masses, in order to preserve the foundations of capitalism, to counteract the wave of class struggle and to stave off the actual revolution which would destroy the bourgeois system of exploitation and political hegemony. However, the coming of reformist parties to power in no way means that the "non-violent revolution" is accomplished as some bourgeois sociologists attempt to suggest. They advance the idea that the social revolution may come about by the simple replacement of one bourgeois party by another, and that it does not demand any militant revolutionary action from the masses or the creation of their own political parties, etc.

There are two sides to the "twisted mind" issue today. On the one hand, there may often be objective elements giving rise to the illusory ideas of the masses. For instance, during the implementation of the "new deal" policy, some reforms objectively compatible with the interests of the masses were effected so as to hoodwink them into thinking that the policy of Roosevelt's administration was in line with their interests. Some sections of the working class may not have realised that this policy was a *forced* concession from the capitalists. Analogies can be drawn between this and what has happened and is now happening in European capitalist countries. In this case, not only explanatory work among the working class but the working masses' own experience and the self-exposure of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties are needed to explode these social illusions. At times, illusions exist over a protracted period of time, and this is partly due to the fact that bourgeois par-

ties replace each other in power and when in opposition are never shy with their paper promises and high-sounding slogans. Illusions are often preserved by a favourable economic situation when a bourgeois party is able to book a definite rise in the standard of living, a fall in unemployment, etc., to its political credit.

But it is crucial to bear in mind the other side of the affair—attempts by bourgeois ideologists to bring organised pressure to bear on the masses, to present them with a host of general, basically misleading, ideas which increase their faith in capitalism and foment a negative attitude to communism which represents the fundamental interests of the working people.

The propaganda machine of modern imperialist states, primarily that of the United States of America, is in receipt of huge funds for massing special forms of influencing public opinion, both at home and abroad. By this method the ideologists of imperialism occasionally achieve some degree of success through propaganda.

Whipping up mass hysteria is just one side of the campaign to brainwash the working people today. The propaganda machine of modern imperialism resorts to this method when contemplating adventurous, openly imperialist policy, contradicting the fundamental interests of the people. The nazis achieved mass hysteria by playing on the animal instincts of the crowd and appealing to nationalistic and chauvinistic sentiments. Mass hysteria as a rule stifles reason and gives rein to raving animal instincts which nazism channelled in the direction it wanted.

The delight with which Hitler's speeches were

received can be partly explained by this mass hysteria.

Even today the ideologists of imperialism have preserved old fascist methods of brainwashing. The difference is that today they have been modernised and improved.

Modern mass hysteria is of the kind used by imperialist ideologists and American propagandists when the "cold war" policy under the J. F. Dulles leadership was being implemented. Then a combination of two methods was used: the anti-communist propaganda machine worked overtime to "substantiate" the communist "threat". It was helped by frequent air-raid warnings, to show the American man in the street the reality of the "communist threat". The ruling circles could now set about introducing political reaction which resulted directly in McCarthyism, persecution of communists, democrats and liberals and also the aggressive course of foreign policy followed by American imperialism, the setting up of a network of military bases on foreign territory, the conclusion of military and political alliances and flagrant violations of the sovereignty of socialist countries.

Mass hysteria whipped up by the imperialist propaganda machine is designed to paint the "communist threat" in realistic colours and create an emotionally tinged negative attitude to communism in the minds of the American people.

Mass hysteria will continue until the real motives of its initiators are exposed. It does not convince people logically, but rather affects them psychologically. Therefore, it is not a substitute for reactionary ideology, but paves the way for it to become acceptable.

Imperialism is forced to adapt itself to new historical conditions, so it seeks an ideological doctrine which at the same time deceives the masses and expresses its reactionary political goals. To formulate this ideological doctrine is as difficult as squaring a circle. The reactionary aims of modern imperialism and its adventurist policy contradicting the historical process are incompatible with the interests of the working people the world over. This explains why the numerous "capitalist manifestoes", "freedom manifestoes", "what is moral" doctrines and other kinds of "rearmaments", advanced by modern bourgeois ideologists as "positive" programmes, burst like soap bubbles without any response from the masses.

Modern imperialist ideologists "rearm" with two ideas: that of anti-communism and that of the so-called "freedom".

Anti-communism is the pivot on which imperialist ideology revolves; it expresses the most malicious aspirations of modern reaction. Reactionary forces foster blind hatred of communism and historical progress. The idea of anti-communism has nothing positive to offer: it promotes destruction, wars and violence and mirrors the real nature of imperialism.

The idea of "freedom", highly popular among the masses, is intended to camouflage imperialist anti-democratic policy aimed at suppressing real freedom. Bourgeois ideologists load their idea of "freedom" with definite social meaning—freedom for capitalist property and private enterprise. Politically, "freedom" means bourgeois hegemony and the spread of bourgeois ideas to other countries. "Freedom", as bourgeois ideologists interpret it, is tainted with dark reaction and

means the suppression of national liberation movements. That is why the so-called campaign for "freedom" is identified with anti-communism. There is good reason why modern imperialist forces, in particular American reaction, shield the most despotic and even the most flagrantly fascist regimes.

How can "freedom" and the protection of the "free world" be combined with reactionary policy designed to squash real freedom? This is the crux of the matter.

Modern imperialist ideologists will never be able to "blend" the ideas of anti-communism and "freedom". Their attempts will always fail and only show the deep-rooted contradictions of imperialist ideology.

Bourgeois ideologists cannot formulate a coherent ideological doctrine. Their real aims and the demagogic propaganda with which they camouflage them cannot coexist in a rational way. That is why they play on the backward psychology of the masses and encourage irrational tendencies as a philosophical basis for anti-communism.

Anti-communism served up as a philosophical system is nothing more than a direct or indirect search for "motives" in accordance with which the wheel of history may be turned back.

2. WHERE IS MANKIND GOING?

Rejection of Social and Intellectual Progress

The unprecedented social progress of the 19th and 20th centuries, inseparably bound with the development of Marxist-Leninist social science, was held by bourgeois philosophy to be mankind's "crisis" and the "death" of the human personality. Mass revolutionary movements, the downfall of old political regimes, the collapse of the imperialist colonial system and the destruction of the usual world which seemed "stable", "comfortable" and "sensible"—all these social processes were interpreted by bourgeois philosophy as the beginning of the era of the "personality crisis" and the era of the masses, "mass consciousness", "mechanical thought" and the "destruction" of culture. A whole galaxy of philosophers were born, beginning with Nietzsche right up to Martin Heidegger and José Ortega y Gasset, who concentrated their attention on problems of "mass", "commonplace" consciousness and intellectual élitism.

World-wide cultural and intellectual progress and the unprecedented development of mass media—the press, radio, television and cinema, which have been able to make basic information and scientific and cultural achievements the property of the widest strata—have raised the con-

sciousness of the masses. All these progressive processes have been interpreted by bourgeois philosophy from an élitist standpoint. It betrayed "anxiety" at these processes and began to think of a way of stopping élitist intellectualism from turning into mass consciousness and of shielding this narrow intellectual nucleus from merging with the masses.

While these entrenched bourgeois philosophers were thinking about "saving" the intellectual élitist, they objectively became the opponents of modern culture and enemies of intellectual progress.

They thought it necessary to form a special élitist "above" the masses. Objectively, these ideas were spiritual prerequisites for suppressing democracy and ultimately establishing fascist dictatorships. The fascists swept through Europe burning books, destroying seats of culture, proclaiming the "new order" and persecuting millions of people in the process. They saved their heaviest blow for the communists and all honest democrats.

Bourgeois and petty-bourgeois philosophers object to "politicising" culture, upholding intellectual "freedom", which in fact is the freedom to struggle against the finest cultural achievements in capitalist countries, the freedom for them to be swallowed up by a surrogate culture.

Intellectual snobbery today is an excuse for mystifying the working people and protecting the underhand methods by which the people are intellectually emasculated.

No effort is spared to prove that refined ideas are alien to the masses, whose actions are dictated by blind instincts and irrational impulses.

Numerous "researches" by modern bourgeois philosophers brim with this kind of assertion. The view they advance is socially dangerous when it infects the ruling imperialist class which controls all the mass media, and the powerful influence which they exert on the consciousness of the masses must not be underestimated. They are used to deprive the working people of class consciousness and a sober understanding of historical events. If all goes according to them, the working masses turn into a servile crowd.

Philosophical literature has stimulated special researches into social psychology and attempts to locate in the human mind a system of levers which, when "pressed", could turn man in the necessary direction. The problem of organised, mass psychological manipulation is what modern bourgeois propaganda is now wrestling with.

In capitalist society the sluices for diffusing and developing the means of psychologically manipulating man's vilest instincts are being opened wider and wider. Bourgeois philosophy attempts to justify these tendencies by the need to "liberate" man's "natural" aspirations from the "tyranny" and "conventions" erected by modern civilisation and intellect. Supporters of this philosophy believe that demolishing "intellectual tyranny" will bring spiritual harmony, leaving no grounds for mental disorders and neuroses. For instance, in his work *Eros and Civilisation*! Herbert Marcuse appeals to mankind to create the kingdom of "free eros", to "liberate" man's instincts and to attain "inner harmony".

! Herbert Marcuse, *Eros and Civilisation*. A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud, New York, 1962.

No matter what subjective aspirations rule authors in works of this kind, their reactionary romanticism, praise of irrational principles in man and "criticism of the intellect" rank them objectively among imperialist reactionaries of the darkest hue.

It must not be ignored that modern imperialist reaction subtly manipulates man as a preliminary to deifying such savage instincts in him as sadism and violence in order to "liberate" man from his conscience. The modern "superman" as bourgeois philosophers see him is a "powerful personality", a man capable of "transgressing" universal laws and norms. American marines or "roaring tigers" are a practical example of the "liberation" of instincts. According to their physiological aims, these detachments are no different from the SS troops of Hitler's Third Reich.

The praise of irrational principles in man is closely linked with the general strategic and tactical aims of anti-communism.

A Pessimistic View of the Future of Mankind

In the modern ideological conflict, the future of mankind is the focus of attention. This problem has probably never plagued people so much as today, and representatives of various philosophical orientations, religious denominations and political parties have wrestled with it.

Paradoxically, the future is exerting a direct and ever increasing influence on the behaviour of man in the present. Hence the reason for this interest at the present stage of history.

This feature of modern society can be explained by the rapid and irregular acceleration of historical development. In fact, the capitalist

phase of development can be by-passed by countries which have freed themselves from colonial oppression even though their economy is backward and semi-feudal. The building of socialism might seem too distant a prospect, but for them it is an immediate concern.

The influence of man's future on his present has been stepped up by unprecedented scientific and technical progress and the invention of nuclear weapons. Scientific inventions are affecting man's way of life and way of thinking to an ever greater extent. As early as the 19th and early 20th centuries, Marxists constantly emphasised the decisive role of the scientific and technological revolutions in world history. The principles of historical materialism formulated by Marx and Engels and developed under new conditions by Lenin were firmly corroborated by reality. Idealist philosophical ideas searching for the main springs of historical events in God, the Absolute Idea of the superhuman activity of individual heroes, were exploded after the dramatic events of history in the 20th century.

In idealist philosophy the link between the present and the future is presented in a perverted form. It understands the future as either independent of real empirical history and given to history from without by God or the Absolute, and therefore shows itself to man full of unexpected elements, or is the result of the arbitrariness of individual heroes. In either case, the future does not have a logical, organic connection with the present. Philosophical notions of this kind are to be found in 20th-century bourgeois literature, too, but they are all to an ever increasing extent anachronistic and show how hopeless-

ly outdated this philosophy is. Some contemporary bourgeois philosophers endeavour to establish a link between the present and the future by analysing separate aspects of history, the factors which in their view fundamentally change both the modern situation, as compared with the preceding stage of historical development, and the future of world history.

However, to single out "decisive factors" of this sort and to interpret them so is to paint a highly one-sided and tendentious picture and outline the future development of mankind inaccurately.

At present, the attention of people the world over is focused on nuclear weapons, the destiny of democracy, the relation between personality and scientific and technological progress, etc.

Of course, everyone's eyes are turned toward the nuclear bomb, for its very existence considerably influences political life and the way people think. Bourgeois socio-political and philosophical literature often analyses the existence of nuclear weapons abstractly without delving into the question of probing the interests and aspirations of the social classes and groups in possession of atomic weapons. Hence, it is assumed that atomic weapons, the industrial base for manufacturing them and scientific research are in themselves a threat to human existence, from which it can be concluded that it is high time to "ban scientists".

The premises on which this argument is based do not hold water and therefore lead to absurd conclusions.

Even though it led to the invention of nuclear weapons, scientific and technological progress is in itself an objective fact and a field of human

activity. Therefore, it is absurd to evaluate the achievements of present-day scientific and technological progress in the same way as we evaluate the behaviour of people, which can be moral and amoral, good and evil. If we turn to history, we see that in all stages of social development the achievements of science and technology have been used for both creative and destructive purposes. The way in which science and technology are harnessed depends on the interests and aspirations of the social groups who possess them. The invention of gunpowder, internal combustion engines, rocket motors and the discovery of atomic energy can all be equally used for peaceful or aggressive purposes. But without the scientific discoveries, which can be mobilised for military use, there would be no modern civilisation.

Popular in bourgeois philosophical literature is the view that man is doomed to *return* to preceding phases of human society in order to escape the apparently insoluble problems which frustrate him at present. For instance, the Spanish philosopher Ferrater Mora suggests returning to the Middle Ages. Other ideas of returning to "primordial human existence" are also put forward. The destruction of modern civilisation, not by military but by social and political methods is augured. In all cases these ideas are reactionary and utopian.

However, these ideas are often put forward as the only alternative to the end of the human race in the holocaust of nuclear war, and hence their spread is understandable. In capitalist countries people are often obsessed by the idea of imminent nuclear threat, or that the historical process can no longer be controlled by human

reason. Nuclear war, it is often thought, would be unleashed by machine-like technical and political forces. Hence the conclusion is drawn that only a rejection of modern civilisation built by man's hands and brains can stave off serious catastrophe. This explains the "back to nature" drive and the idealisation of the way of life of primitive people in "complete harmony" with themselves and the world around them.

At the end of the 50s and beginning of the 60s, bourgeois countries were hit by the sensational success of *On the Beach*¹ by the Australian writer Nevil Shute. Between 1958, when it was first published, and 1963 the book had come out in 19 editions and had been given a glittering review in the bourgeois press. *The Washington Post and Times Herald* proclaimed that Nevil Shute's book was "the most important and dramatic novel of the atomic age. If you read only one book a year, this should be the one".

Shute's success is attributable to his attempt to outline the "psychology" of people facing certain death from radiation on a small piece of land, namely, Australia, who survived a nuclear war. The author asks himself the question: how will people behave if they know about their inevitable destruction and the destruction of the whole human race? He believes that if people are under intense mental stress they will act basically normally. They will retain their habits and interests, feelings of love and friendship, but all this will assume slightly abnormal forms—a kind of belief in dying symbols, together with which people themselves will die.

¹ Nevil Shute, *On the Beach*, The New American Library of World Literature, Inc., 1963.

The author completely rejects the idea of a "pest during a plague" though in this situation it might seem justified.

In fact, this idea pinpoints the author's psychology. All events in the book—from the beginning of the nuclear war to the destruction of the last people on earth—follow one another like a concatenation of irrational, fatal events. Man is like a puppet in the hands of these events, and his thought processes, feelings and actions evolve mechanically and not by his own will. All attempts to take a step beyond the limits of these events look like cowardice and hysteria. The chief characters of the story, the Australian naval officer Peter Holmes and the American submarine commander Towers are heroes in the author's view, but their heroism means that they retain their habits and their affection for their past life and are not attracted to any positive action, which is apparently impossible.

A sensation also blew up in the West over *Brave New World*¹ by Aldous Huxley, the celebrated English writer, historian and publicist. The book first came out in 1933 and is republished practically every year. Huxley's basic idea is that paradoxically present-day scientific and technological progress does not extend freedom but limits it until in the end freedom ceases to exist. The author paints a picture of the world which, in his view, is fatally imminent for the human race, a world which will bring little consolation for mankind. Huxley believes that the scientific organisation of labour and social life will lead to the deprivation of human freedom.

¹ Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World*, Bantam Books, New York, 1962.

More important is that man will not suffer at all from this. In this world, man's life is fully regimented by science; he becomes a cog in the social machine, devoid of independent thought and feeling. Man, in essence, loses sight of the aims in life. It is as if his life has been preordained by the place allotted him in the labour machine set up on the basis of science. Everyone has his own place in the social structure, earmarked from the moment of birth. The masses are deprived of any political life. Political power is concentrated in the hands of the man whose job it is to keep an eye on the even rhythm of the social machine revolving year in year out in the same old circle. His task is to ensure the smooth flow of the well-oiled machine. The horror of the situation is that society turns into this machine. Outwardly it is a rich flourishing society, but it is devoid of inner life; it has no soul.

There can be no doubt that though the philosophical ideas behind this special kind of fatalism are fundamentally misleading, one side of the matter cannot be ignored. They reflect important objective tendencies in the development of bourgeois society. The divorce of the people from political power, the alienation of science and technology from the people inevitably give birth to a fatalistic view of the socio-historical processes. The man in the street in bourgeois society does not and cannot hope that his opinion, his views, quite rational to him, can carry any weight in grappling with the crucial problems of social life.

Whether war is to be declared or not—a question affecting the lives of hundreds of millions of people—lies within the province of a narrow

group of bourgeois politicians, whose interests are opposed to those of the working people. As a result, events take a course contrary to the will of the people, who interpret them as the work of blind, uncontrollable forces. Similarly, the alienation of science and technology in bourgeois society, their use for exploiting and suppressing the people and the screen put round the levers which make science and technology operate contrary to the people's interests, all make people believe that technology itself is governed by these inner laws, which act contrary to man's interests and that in general technology is a force alien to man.

The pessimistic view of man's future to be found in contemporary bourgeois ideas is thus not the arbitrary fantasy of bourgeois thinkers, but a reflection of the objective state of affairs turned upside down, whereby political power, science and technology are estranged from the people. Bourgeois philosophical and sociological thought cannot raise itself above the existing social relations; it observes the world through these relations and the future of society is also determined through them.

Is There a Way Out? Bourgeois philosophical thought categorically states that capitalist society is confronted by a historical impasse. This does not mean that it does not endeavour to find a way out. It is interesting to examine how bourgeois philosophy attempts to solve this question, as here its class and party character becomes most apparent. Bourgeois philosophers do not usually speak about the crisis of the capitalist social system but about the crisis of the human race in general. Accordingly, they try to find the beginnings of the crisis not

in concrete social relations but within a scheme of factors encompassing the whole of mankind, such as the invention of nuclear weapons, soaring technical progress, man's spiritual make-up, etc.

So when the question is raised of how to weather the historical crisis and by what methods, bourgeois philosophy is usually quick to "reveal" the concrete social root of the evil and demands that it be neutralised or even wiped out.

It is interesting in this context to note *The Twilight of Civilisation*¹ by Jacques Maritain, first published in 1939. In his work Maritain maintains the thesis that the political convulsions of the 20th century—the appearance of fascism, the concomitant cult of violence and the rise of racism were foreshadowed by the philosophical traditions of classical humanism. Classical Renaissance humanism and the materialist philosophy connected with it resulted in atheism and this, in Maritain's view, led to the social upheavals and disasters of the 20th century.

In Maritain's logic the conclusion is only too obvious: materialist philosophy must be demolished and atheism and atheism uprooted. Then social stability will be restored and all the factors threatening the human race will "disappear".

To reinstate the discarded God is what modern bourgeois philosophers often call upon people to do. The logical question follows: is it possible to bring back what has been irretrievably lost? Surely it is factually impossible to

make atheists believe in God again. If we take up the practice of forcibly thrusting religion on people who do not want it, will not this mean a return to the ideas behind the "crusades", with which the church in the Middle Ages armed itself and which did so much evil? The history of mankind shows that Christianity's 2000 years has not been the salvation of man. Rather the opposite, Christianity has fomented religious fanaticism, has engineered bloody religious wars. The church and its clergy have been parasites hindering the growth of human society. To count on (God the Saviour, at present, is especially dangerous, for if the people do not take their destiny into their own hands, they are threatened by never-ending calamities in the hands of bourgeois adventurist politicians.

The question of a moral, harmonious society made up of atheists has long been a moot point in philosophy. Today countries of mass atheism already exist. How then must the historical experience of the countries where atheism has become the reigning spiritual force be interpreted and understood?

Jacques Maritain and some other bourgeois philosophers try to link atheism with fascism. Their reasoning is developed roughly on the following lines: in Germany the fascists denied God; they accepted the Nietzschean thesis that "God had died" and drove their country to a historical catastrophe thereby mortally injuring the whole of humanity. Therefore the effective "panacea" from social convulsions is a return to God. It must be pointed out here and now that the fascists were not atheists. They plundered towns and villages and murdered people under the slogan of "God with us". Moreover, the then

¹ See J. Maritain, *The Twilight of Civilisation*, New York, 1944.

Catholic Church concluded an anti-communist alliance with Hitler. The church was thus by no means an obstacle to Hitler's barbarism. On the contrary, it lent a helping hand. Of course, it must be remembered that the patriotic clergy of both the Catholic and Orthodox Churches took part in the resistance movement against fascism, but this does not prove that Christianity was the ideology which mobilised the people in their struggle against fascism. Democracy and socialism were the base on which various forces united to break the fascist backbone.

The 7th Comintern Congress of 1935 advanced the slogans and ideas which launched the correct and most successful line of attack against fascism. Communists are guided by the philosophical principles of dialectical and historical materialism irreconcilable with religion. Marxist-Leninist philosophy is not only a great scientific force providing accurate insight into events but also a moral force affirming the principles of real humanism and laying down guide-lines for effective action in the struggle for man's rights and freedom.

Of course, affirmation of these principles is not free of contradictions. The mistakes connected with the personality cult brought about a breach of moral principles and norms. These facts in no way promoted real humanism but were a retreat from it. As soon as there is a retreat in practice from the principles of dialectical and historical materialism and real humanism, and one man is deified, the individual is immediately regarded as something negligible, and it is he who suffers from arbitrariness and breaches of morals and the law.

A moral society is one which consistently prac-

tises the principles of real humanism, and the philosophical basis of this is dialectical and historical materialism. The historical experience of the past decades is adequate confirmation of this.

Marxists adhere to a realistic point of view and they respect the principles of freedom of conscience. They strive to rally all people of good will into the campaign for peace, irrespective of their philosophical views. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries strictly uphold the principles of non-interference in the internal affairs of other states and observe the principles of international law and the United Nations Charter. This standpoint is a vital preliminary to stabilising peace and taking further steps to ease international tension. It is socialism which proclaims and implements the policy of international agreements and of recognising in word and deed the equality of big and small states. Socialism rejects imperialist policy which uses armed violence against other peoples. It upholds the freedom and independence of all nations.

The international policy of socialism, its popularity and authority force bourgeois ideologists to adapt themselves to new surroundings, to seek ways of smutting socialist policy and touching up the fading colours of imperialism.

Bourgeois philosophical literature debates the possibility of settling social contradictions by radically changing the principles of political thought. This idea is considered on the basis of existentialist philosophy. Highly symptomatic of this is Karl Jaspers' *The Future of Mankind* (1958).

What does Jaspers say? He puts the invention of the nuclear bomb and the social and political conflict between the capitalist and the socialist world in the forefront of all present-day social and political life, painting the communist movement as a "totalitarian" movement opposing the "free", i.e., capitalist West. Jaspers openly admits that Germany during the Nazi dictatorship and Franco Spain belong to the so-called "free" Western world. "Spain," he writes, "lives under a dictatorship but is not totalitarian; her history, her present spiritual reality, her knowledge of individual liberty and dignity unquestionably rank her with the West."

"Germany was under a dictatorship for twelve years, and for seven of those she was totalitarian; yet she, too, belongs to the West."¹ For Jaspers "freedom" is identical with anti-communism irrespective of in what form it appears—whether as fascist dictatorship or bourgeois democracy. The conflict with socialist countries and the newly developing world alarms Jaspers now that the communist movement is such a solid economic, military, political and ideological force that to break its back in an open military clash is no longer possible. Jaspers feels that the ground under the old world's feet is shifting, that the people are following the communists and so he seeks "new" paths to save the capitalist world. He considers that the old principles of political thought, which allowed disputes to be settled with the help of diplomatic and military means are going through a very

critical period. He suggests looking for salvation, but this will not come as a gift but will be revealed to man in dreams. "Dreams can open possibilities,"¹ writes Jaspers.

What does Jaspers dream about? He proposes that the capitalist world change its character but preserve the basic tenets of capitalism. In Jaspers' view, the so-called "free world" ought to be attractive to the masses and must become outwardly "humanistic". Moreover, mankind must feel that the end of the so-called "free world" will mean the end of mankind. Jaspers suggests that mankind must be infatuated by the "ideals" of capitalism; it is sometimes necessary to adopt beautiful stoical poses, but if the masses will not believe in these poses, they must be "shaken up" and persuaded to feel the open threat of thermonuclear war.

Jaspers does not regard technology as absolute evil; he considers it a "part of evil" in that it offers the human race various possibilities. In his view, the basic problem is to change *man himself*. And here the lead ought to be taken by philosophy in helping man "to find himself". He suggests that modern man "raise himself" to the level of transcending the highest, supernatural world.² He asserts this will be a break-through in usual policy. He appeals to God and providence, but changes somewhat the Christian commandment of "Thou shalt not kill". He believes that today this commandment need not be strictly followed and all its consequences be deduced. "God," says Jaspers, "has not told man to destroy himself but has given him a choice in

¹ Karl Jaspers, *The Future of Mankind*, Chicago and London, 1963, p. 123-24. (Quotation from American edition.)

¹ Ibid., p. 55.

² Ibid., p. 223.

time: survival, on condition of changing into a better man, or doom."¹

How is man to better himself and survive? He considers that man must free himself from so-called scientific prejudices, the chief ones being, in his view, Marxism and its philosophy, and from the communist "threat".

Jaspers' suggestion of reverting to "super-politics" does not indicate any realistic ways and means of struggling against imperialist forces which are at the back of the aggravation of international tension and the greater danger of the outbreak of aggressive wars and the rebirth of neonazism.

3. THE STRATEGY AND TACTICS OF ANTI-COMMUNISM

Anti-communism— Immediately after the Second World War the reinstatement of old and the creation of new anti-communist organisations entailed certain difficulties. Broad sections of the people realised that anti-communism paves the way to fascism. Therefore, in capitalist countries anti-communist organisations were formed under new names outwardly not resembling fascist slogans and even apparently directed against them.

At the end of the 50s and beginning of the 60s, the bourgeois press began to print more and more frequent articles and memoranda extensively surveying the activity and political programmes of ultra Right-wing anti-communist organisations. Ultra Right-wing leaders had thought it high time to launch an open political attack and to start blowing their trumpet. It must be pointed out that by this time bourgeois propaganda had become so efficient at setting public opinion against communism that the Right-wing entry into the open political arena did not call forth a sufficiently effective and negative response from the masses, particularly in such countries as the U.S.A. and West Germany.

In the U.S.A. McCarthy's brand of anti-communist hysteria contributed much to paralysing

¹ Ibid., p. 225.

democratic and liberal forces. The persecution of the liberally minded professorate at American universities, the tumultuous lawsuits against the United States Communist Party and political and economic persecutions of democrats and Left-wing representatives have all contributed to weakening opposition to ultra Right-wing reaction. Although McCarthyism ultimately discredited itself and McCarthy himself died, he managed to implant fear in the average American's mind and "circumspection" and "caution" in his thoughts and words. This again hampered possible opposition to ultra Right-wing, essentially neofascist, organisations proposing the most militant anti-communism and "Americanism".

As a result, in the United States about a thousand ultra Right-wing organisations were able to flourish. This number includes organisations with "traditions" and comparatively young ones. One of the most entrenched is the John Birch Society. It was formed in 1958 with its headquarters in Massachusetts. Its leader, Robert Welch, openly declared that his aim was to gain control of the White House. The John Birch Society widened the scope of its activity by forming branches in various other states and penetrated into social organisations. It sets great store by penetrating into the major bourgeois parties, especially the Republican Party whose ultra-reactionary wing the Birchists most actively support. During the 1963-64 presidential election campaign they came out in favour of Barry Goldwater's policy. The Birchists advertise their success in every conceivable way and their boasts are certainly well founded. They manage to wheedle their way right through to the Republican Party policy-makers and to exert their

ideological influence on them. As affirmed by the Birchists, out of the 260-man central committee of the Republican Party in the Los Angeles district, 50 are members of the John Birch Society. One of them, John Roussetot is the head of the propaganda department and, according to reports, by his influence, the Society's second-in-command.

In 1965, the Birchists moved their head office to Washington hoping to exert greater influence on Congress. R. Benson, the son of the former Minister of Agriculture in the Eisenhower government, was made the Society's chief lobbyist. It must be pointed out that the Society's funds are soaring. In 1959 they amounted to \$130,000, in 1963 to \$1,000,000 and in 1965 to \$3,200,000.

The John Birch Society is a conspiratorial organisation; its total membership is a closely guarded secret, but in 1964 it was rumoured that the Society had in the region of 100,000 members. The Society has its own newspaper the *American Opinion* and an organisational centre, Council of 26.

In 1960 the Minutemen, led by the businessman Robert de Pugh (Norborn, Montana) were organised. This is essentially a military, ultra Right-wing organisation in control of weapons, which instructs its members in methods of seizing television and radio stations and telephone exchanges, etc., and makes lists of persons to be assassinated in the event of a crisis stemming from the imminent "communist threat". The organisation operates so much in secret that the majority of members only know each other by numbers. The minutemen blackmail progressive people and liberals and try to cow American po-

liticians opposing government policy in Vietnam. In April 1966, the *Kansas City Star* reported that the minutemen were hatching a plot to assassinate Senator Fulbright. Robert de Pugh admitted this. The newspaper also reported that some of the minutemen were planning to poison the air conditioning system in the United Nations.

The ultra Right-wing movement in the U.S.A. is continuing the traditions of the pro-fascist organisations which were active in the 30s and openly danced to Hitler's and Mussolini's ideological tunes. For instance, among the policy-makers of the Christian Anti-communist Crusade with about 500,000 followers, the chief ring-leader is Allen Zoll, a member of the former German-American Bund and a brazen anti-semitic.

The neofascist organisations seek to bring ideological pressure to bear on American youth, systematically organising meetings and forming special youth organisations of an anti-communist hue. Of them it is worth mentioning Young Americans for Freedom which actively supports the Birchists and Barry Goldwater. The organisation holds meetings in aid of "world liberation", attended by a cross-section of the hardest political reactionaries. In the autumn of 1965 one such meeting took place in Madison Square Garden where about 20,000 Birchists assembled. Hecklers from the American Nazi Party were also there. This rabble met Barry Goldwater with a roar of approval and demanded an end to the UN.

Ultra Right-wing ties with big business are becoming increasingly transparent every day. It is common knowledge that the John Birch Society's filhrer, Robert Welch, was vice-pres-

ident of the National Association of Industrialists and the chairman of its consultative educational council.

The Texas multi-millionaire Haroldson Lafayette Hunt, who was hand in glove with Edwin Walker, a retired general and well-known reactionary, gathered a fine bevy of militant anti-communists and fascist politicians around him.

In recent years the tendency of various ultra Right-wing organisations to merge has been observed in the U.S.A. together with attempts to co-ordinate their activity. In March 1962 representatives of 76 ultra Right-wing organisations formed a co-ordination committee which systematically arranges secret conferences in Washington.

U.S. ultra Right-wing forces organise acts of terrorism against Negroes and progressive supporters of democratic freedoms. The Ku Klux Klan has made a big name for itself in this respect. Richard Flowers, the Alabama Attorney General who is well acquainted with the Ku Klux Klan's activity, called it a vile, savage organisation. He points out that the Ku Klux Klan has recently progressed from severely beating up people to the use of dynamite, for which special "demolition squads" have been organised within the society.

Ultra Right-wing forces have stepped up their activity as a result of the dirty war which American imperialism is waging in Vietnam. They organise demonstrations in support of the war which all reactionaries attend, from members of the American Legion to the Cuban counter-revolutionaries. Those who want an end to the Vietnam war are subjected to open political pressure and systematic victimisation. The

following fact illustrates this point. On January 10, 1966 a session of the Georgian legislative assembly opened. However, Julian Bond, a Negro, was not allowed to attend although in November 1965 he had been duly elected in full accordance with the law. The reason was Bond's condemnation of the American war in Vietnam. George Smith, Georgia's representative to the House of Representatives, stated that he would set up a special committee to look into the question of Bond's "loyalty" and "fitness" to be a member of the legislative assembly. On February 10, the District Court in Atlanta ordered that Bond be relieved of his deputy's mandate. This is American democracy in action.

Political reaction launches its heaviest attack against communists who denounce American imperialist aggression and uphold the principles of consistent democracy.

Anti-communist hysteria makes American state bodies act in absurd ways. For instance, the Department of Health, Education and Social Security has adopted a resolution by which two million aged Americans of 65 years and over have to make written testimonies under oath to the effect that in the last twelve months they have not been in contact with "any communist organisation, communist front organisation or organisation into which communists have infiltrated" before they are eligible for medical assistance.

Blackmail, open violence, bribes and the organisation of various kinds of conspiracies are becoming more and more part of the U.S. state apparatus. These methods are widely used particularly by the FBI against those who favour

an end to the war in Vietnam. FBI agents have shadowed members of the Students for Democratic Society organisation and bring systematic pressure to bear on the university authorities to make them "take measures" against those students who want the Vietnam war stopped. There is also considerable victimisation of the workers in the Du Bois Clubs, a progressive organisation opposing American aggression in Vietnam.

The FBI and CIA are interfering more and more frequently in the internal affairs of other states. They actively help various kinds of reactionary organisations, doing all they can to promote pro-American leaders to power. In various countries the CIA is now using methods, already "tested" in Latin America. CIA agents infiltrate into many countries disguised as diplomats and organise various forms of provocation against progressive and democratic people.

In West Germany the rebirth of fascism has been rapid. Former SS-men and active nazis have kept quiet for a while only in order to be able to get into the highest posts in the state, strengthen their political position and then launch their attack on the democratic forces of West Germany. One of the crucial steps taken in this direction was the suppression of the German Communist Party. Neonazism thereby cleared the way for its political advance.

By the end of 1965, West Germany had a total of 113 ultra Right-wing organisations. The autumn of 1964 witnessed the formation of the National Democratic Party of Germany which took part in the 1964 election campaign and re-

ceived 2 per cent of the total vote. In 1966 the neonazist National Democratic Party managed to obtain 15 seats in the Bavarian Landtag. The party's programme demands an end to the persecution of nazi war criminals and to the compensation of nazi victims. Of 24 of the party's leaders, 11 are former active nazis.

Although the bourgeois press occasionally criticises the party, its policies have much in common with those of the government parties. In West Germany the circulation of ultra-Right-wing publications especially reactionary neofascist newspapers is soaring. Nazi provocation is also rocketing. In 1964, 171 incidents were recorded and in 1965, 521.

SS diehards in West Germany have thrown off all restraint and now regularly organise meetings. On the 24th of October 1965, one of these regular meetings took place in Rendsburg and was attended by some 1,000 people including Sepp Dietrich, the chief of Hitler's personal bodyguard. West German revanchists are more and more frequently resorting to the method of terrorism used in Hitler's day—the burning of books, setting fire to homes and sending of letters containing poisonous powder which causes blindness. One important personality in the Evangelist Church, Pastor Wilm, who favoured a rational policy in respect of the eastern frontiers of Germany, received a letter which said: "Number your bones so that the doctor can collect them later. The police is on our side." The letter was signed: "Union of national societies".

The Action Oder-Neisse organisation, an assembly point for the ring-leaders of the revanchist countrymen's associations, has considerable

ly intensified its activity. It disseminates leaflets not only in West Germany but in Italy, France, Austria and other countries. On October 28th, 1965, Johann Gradl, the West German minister for displaced persons, stated that the Oder-Neisse frontier was not by any means fixed and that Bonn intended to annex Polish territory "by all political, moral and lawful means". In an even harsher form, revanchist ideas are advanced in a book entitled *The Grand Design* by Josef Strauss, the former West German defence minister.

West German nazis incite and support Austrian revanchists. In January 1966 the trial of 58 nationalists was held in Milan; they had committed terrorist acts in Alto Adige (Italian South Tirol). Some of them later disappeared into West Germany. Terrorists are active not only in Alto Adige but in Verona, Milan and Rome. The revanchists demand the secession of South Tirol from Italy and are equipped with weapons and explosives to back up their demands. Links between these terrorists and organisations in West Germany and Austria have been disclosed. These links were established by the well-known nazi Norbert Bürger, once reader in the University of Innsbruck and now living in Munich (West Germany). The terrorist ring-leader was Joachim Lotar Dunkel, whose diary contained notes reminiscent of Hitler's *Mein Kampf*. Kuen, one of the terrorists, admitted the existence of a link between terrorist organisations and the Gehlen intelligence service.

West German revanchists also try to extend their ideological influence in the countries of the Third World. With this aim in mind they formed an organisation called *Deutsche Entwick-*

lungshilfe on the lines of the American Peace Corps. At the end of 1964 they sent their volunteers to India, Nepal, Afghanisan, Nigeria, Brazil and other countries with the aim of propagandising "the Western way of life" and disseminating anti-communism.

Anti-communist and neonazi organisations also exist in other European countries—England, France, Sweden and Holland, not to mention the countries where fascism is in power (Spain, Greece and Portugal). West Germany has strong ties with Spain and Portugal. It also tries to strengthen its military ties with the racistist regime in the Republic of South Africa. At the present time a political and military rapprochement among white racistists in Africa—the Republic of South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, the Portuguese colonies—and among European reactionary political forces is being cemented. The European racistists have stepped up their activity as a result of Southern Rhodesia's declaration of "independence". In England, for instance, there is the League of Empire Loyalists. Chesterton, its leader, has admitted that he repeatedly gave aid to the racistist Candour League in the Republic of South Africa and organised propaganda in support of Ian Smith's regime. Maxwell Grey, chairman of the Candour League in the Republic of South Africa stated that the League had issued an appeal to collect \$500,000 sterling to support Ian Smith's regime. Associations of Southern Rhodesian Loyalists have been set up in the Republic of South Africa and in England.

Ultra Right-wing groups have also intensified their activity in many Latin American countries. They have acquired the name of go-

pilla and their political influence makes itself most felt in Argentina.

Argentine gorillas have close contacts with Brazilian military circles and with them arrange interference in the affairs of any Latin American country where the "communist threat" arises.

Ultra Right-wing and pro-fascist organisations are becoming more and more active in Chile, where they oppose democratic reforms. At the end of 1965 the Chilean government tabled an agrarian reform bill. In answer to this, on December 19th, 1965, the pro-fascist Party of National Action, whose real leader is Jorge Prat, the former Minister of Finance, organised a meeting in one of Santiago's cinemas. At this meeting the Party's chairman Sergio Honofre Jaraa openly called for rebellion and street fighting.

Neofascist organisations oppose democracy in Central American countries. The anti-communist Free Costa Rica organisation is active. It energetically hampers the development of democracy in the country and, according to the press was planning a coup.

Mexico has also been the scene of neofascist activity. For instance, in the town of Pueblo there are two pro-fascist organisations—Mexican Catholic Action and University Anti-communist Front which concentrate their fire on the country's progressive forces.

US imperialism does all in its power to support the ultra Right-wing reactionary forces of Latin America. This aid includes economic and political pressure on the workers' democratic rights, and goes as far as open armed intervention as happened in the Dominican Republic.

The U.S.A. methodically trains police forces to combat the guerrilla movement in Latin American countries. In the Panama Canal area the United States has military and rocket-launching bases and aerodromes. In the same area they own a number of forts which they use for instructing Latin American soldiers and officers in methods of suppressing national movement. Latin American pilots are instructed at Albrook Field and at the Howard base at Fort Keble. The naval academy has bases on the Pacific and Atlantic coasts at its disposal. In the canal area there is an Inter-American Police Academy where instruction in repressive action is given.

At Fort Gulick "students" are trained in the art of jungle and forest warfare against the guerillas.

In Asian countries, too, ultra Right-wing reactionary forces have become noticeably more active in recent years. U.S. imperialism relies on them to carry out its aggressive policy. In Thailand special police detachments are being formed to combat the "threat" of communist infiltration. Right-wing organisations in Japan, Indonesia and other Asian countries have all intensified their activity.

Anti-communist organisations use American imperialism to prevent the national awakening of the Asian countries and to put a brake on the growing struggle for full national independence.

American anti-communists spare no efforts to co-ordinate the work of anti-communist organisations in Asia. American anti-communist representatives take part at sessions of the Directors' Council of the Asian Peoples' Anti-communist

League (APAL). Representatives of U.S. anti-communist organisations attended the Directors' Council held on November 16th and 17th, 1965, at the Freedom Centre in Seoul.

In November 1964, the 10th conference of the Asian Peoples Anti-communist League was held in Taiwan. It was attended by representatives of anti-communist organisations from Australia, India, Iran, Japan, Jordan, South Korea, Laos, Liberia, Libya, Malaysia, Thailand, Turkey and South Vietnam. Anti-communist organisations in Belgium, France, West Germany, Italy, Sweden and Switzerland sent their representatives to the conference as observers. Spain sent her former Minister of Foreign Affairs, Alberto Martin Artajo. An active part at the conference was played by representatives of the Anti-bolshevik Bloc of Nations, a union of émigrés who suggested that a "world-wide" anti-communist congress be organised.

Representatives from the All-American Conference in Defence of the Continent, the All-American Conference to Combat Communism and other anti-communist organisations contributed to the work of the conference. Senators, congressmen, party leaders and ministers from various countries also attended.

The network of anti-communist organisations today has spread like cancer over many countries and continents. This network is the organisational basis which enables reactionary, neofascist forces to launch their attack on democracy, the national liberation and anti-colonial movement and the forces of socialism.

The rapid growth of anti-communist and flagrant fascist organisations after the war does not mean, however, that fascism today is politi-

cally sturdier than it was in the 30s and 40s. Modern fascism has not the same mass political foundation that it had up to the end of the Second World War. This is explained by the historical experience which is influencing today as much as in the past, the consciousness of people all over the world and by the victories of socialist and democratic forces. Nevertheless, it would be wrong to underestimate the influence and danger of fascism. There can be no doubt that its ideological aims continue to exert definite influence on some petty-bourgeois sections of the people. Neofascist organisations enjoy the support of imperialist forces which rely on their ideological aims mirrored in the political aspirations of the most aggressive militarist circles of finance capital.

"The Global Way of Thinking"

The "global way of thinking" is typical of the extreme, militarist wing of modern anti-communism which aims at interference in the internal affairs of other states and the establishment of a new "world order".

The logical successes of the communist movement, the increasing number of Communist Parties, the emergence of the world socialist system after the war, the collapse of the imperialist colonial system and the consolidation of democratic forces throughout the world are noted by modern anti-communists and given peculiar interpretation. They attribute the successes scored by the forces of peace, democracy and socialism to a "communist conspiracy" and the activity of multiple networks of communist "agents", which supposedly, ensure the formation of socialist states and wreck imperialist hegemony in various parts of the world. The ideas of commu-

nist "infiltration," "conspiratorial activity" and "external aggression" are widely trafficed by modern anti-communists.

The neofascist, ultra Right, anti-communist wing is often morbidly obsessed by these ideas. The Birchists, for instance, keep systematic account of the amount of communist infiltration into the state apparatus of capitalist countries, including that of the U.S.A. They "attribute" all the ills of modern capitalism, even economic slumps, to the activity of "communist agents". They are panic-stricken by any reform, any, even non-political, change, which they always interpret as part of the "communist conspiracy".

The neofascists call for active opposition to the "moderates" and "liberals" whose views are allegedly packed with communist borrowings. The ultra Rights are clearly making use of anti-communist mass hysteria to intensify their attack on democracy.

When this way of thinking infects state leaders, as was the effect of McCarthyism, a black cloud of reaction threatens the country, "witch-hunting" begins, all democrats and liberals are subjected to victimisation and repression, and a wave of mass anti-communist and anti-democratic hysteria is set in motion.

There are even more "subtle" "global ways of thinking". Some bourgeois leaders use anti-communism as a special kind of cover-up for pursuing essentially the same policy, only in a more flexible form. Occasionally they allow themselves to "criticise" "extreme thinking" in order to create the impression that their own position is "respectable", "not given to extremes" and is always guided by "common sense".

Ex-President Johnson on more than one oc-

casion made pretentious statements to the effect that his policy was channelled towards curbing extremes of both a Left-wing and Right-wing stamp. In practice, however, he pursued a most reactionary policy of suppression of the working class, the national liberation and democratic movements and did not stop at flagrant aggression against socialist countries. His policy had been propped up by "legal" supports. On September 20, 1965, the American Congress adopted a resolution empowering the U.S.A. to declare unilaterally the need for military intervention in any Latin American country where the "communist threat" arises. The American imperialists endeavour to present their aggression in Vietnam as "legitimate", supposedly "staying off" "communist aggression" from without.

This policy is essentially governed by the same aims as that of ultra Right-wing forces.

The U.S.A. government does not want to admit that modern revolutionary movements are made by the people, for the people, while imperialist policy is essentially anti-democratic, for it is aimed at suppressing real freedom. If the U.S. government were to admit this, the whole bourgeois propaganda machine would swiftly grind to a halt.

No matter how modern imperialist ideologists work out their verbal gymnastics, "peace", "freedom" and "social progress" cannot mean flagrant aggression and the use of napalm bombs, gases and punitive detachments which are wiping out the civilian population one by one. Anyone who follows the home and foreign policy of imperialism today will realise that these facts are not chance episodes, but exam-

ples of the real reactionary nature of modern imperialism in action. The inner discord and deep-rooted contradiction between high-sounding propaganda and real imperialist policy are apparent to even the most politically inexperienced person today. In practice, imperialism is exposing the real aims of its political strategy which were worked out in the period after the Second World War.

It must be pointed out that in his Message to Congress in January 1966, President Johnson stated that the Vietnam war was not an isolated episode but a link in the chain of American policy which the U.S.A. has pursued "with unwavering consistency" after the Second World War.

In his Message to Congress in January 1966, President Johnson proposed the *principle of force* as the primary principle of this policy. The use of open violence to back home and foreign policy shows how ineffective bourgeois propaganda is.

Today the political goals of the anti-communist forces acquire more and more clear-cut outlines. *First*, anti-communism today aims at restoring the former imperialist domination in ex-colonial and dependent countries, but in a new form. Walt Rostow, a former U.S. presidential adviser and a militant anti-communist, formulated this strategic task in the speech he delivered on March 15, 1965, at Freiburg University (West Germany) on the role of young states in world politics. The backbone of American imperialist political strategy in the developing countries, in Walt Rostow's view, is to form military alliances between these countries and mobilise them in the battle against communism;

to render military and economic aid to the countries which take up anti-communist positions; to organise a system of propaganda against communist ideas; and to deploy the U.S.A.'s military power as the spearhead of the attack on communism. The speaker openly added that communism in Asia and Africa would have to face the whole military power of the U.S.A. At the present time the U.S.A. has a vast number of military bases scattered over various continents. These bases are regarded as military and political strongpoints for launching an attack on national liberation, anti-colonial and revolutionary movements and as a means of wrecking revolutionary movements wherever they arise. The punitive expeditions of American troops to the Congo and the Dominican Republic show how well American imperialism is carrying out the task of world gendarme which it has taken upon itself.

Another form of American imperialist political intervention is the use of Peace Corps agents whose activities extend to many countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The Peace Corps also opposes the forces of democracy and socialism, but in other forms. Its agents are linked with the CIA and, under cover of rendering technical, medical, cultural and other aid to the developing countries, promote the interests of their mother organisation. This form is considered convenient in many respects as the Peace Corps agents can easily side-step political and diplomatic barriers in the developing countries. In order to lighten the work of these agents, the Americans make wide use of Negroes.

Imperialism today uses all the methods it has

at its disposal to strengthen the positions of political reaction in the developing countries, to put reactionary stooges in power and thereby to block the growing national liberation movement. Flagrantly racist and pro-fascist regimes are actively supported by reactionary anti-communist forces. Typical in this instance is the moral and political support from ultra right-wing quarters of Ian Smith who unilaterally declared the "independence" of Southern Rhodesia and established the bloody dictatorship of the country's white minority. Writing in the *New York Herald Tribune* on October 31st, 1965, Barry Goldwater stated that Ian Smith's policy was fully in keeping with the spirit of the American revolution which asserted white domination over the native population, who were herded into reservations and forcibly deprived of land. Rhodesia, said Goldwater, was repeating the American revolution on the African continent.

Barry Goldwater's statement highlights the real goals of present-day imperialist politicians who are endeavouring to strengthen the hegemony of the white minority in Africa and to set up a bloc of racist regimes as political outposts of imperialism on the African continent.

In other continents, too, various kinds of attempts are being made to consolidate reactionary forces, which are hand in glove with present-day imperialism.

Second, modern anti-communism wants to review the results of the Second World War and revise European frontiers as they stand today. To achieve this the biggest stake is on West German revanchist forces, which were

nursed by American imperialism and are now ready to take care of themselves.

The West German revanchists believe that a new era has opened up in the history of their country and that it is high time to appear in the political world with new demands, inspired by the increased power of West Germany and its ability to sway decisively the whole course of European politics. This idea was put forward by the former West German Chancellor Ludwig Erhard in a government statement in November 1965. The same idea is expressed in an even harsher form in the book entitled *The Grand Design*, written by Franz-Josef Strauss, the Minister of Finance of the Federal Republic of Germany (in the Kiesinger Government). In this book he expounds his ideas about the need for "creating a Europe" stretching from the Atlantic to the River Bug and the Black Sea and flagranty suggests doing away with the old frontiers in Central and Eastern Europe established as a result of the Second World War.

The Aims and Tactics of Propaganda

Anti-communist propaganda today fulfils an important function in imperialist states. This voluntary army of anti-communist "sharpshooters" is not only utilised but also organised by the bourgeois state apparatus. The bourgeois state finances anti-communist propaganda, sets up its special centres and works out the strategy and tactics of its operations. For instance, the American government controls a powerful propaganda centre, the United States Information Agency (USIA), with branches all over the world. The USIA has 12,000 employees and releases prop-

aganda through 116 centres, which publish 85 journals in 25 languages and 60 newspapers and other periodicals. In foreign countries the Agency controls 7,000 film projection cameras and its radio station The Voice of America broadcasts in 37 foreign languages for about 800 hours a week. Its material is issued to local stations and transmitted in 65 languages for more than 5,000 hours a week. The USIA's television material is distributed to 87 countries.

It is noticeable that the tactics of anti-communist propaganda, especially that destined for the population of socialist countries, underwent several changes after the war. If we compare anti-communist propaganda of the 20s and 30s we shall see that it was massed into a "frontal attack". Its aim was to discredit the building of socialism in the U.S.S.R.; it prophesied "the inevitable failure" of the "bolshhevik experiment" and strove to foment hatred of the Soviet people in capitalist countries. The propaganda was always coarse in content, taking the form of outright attacks on socialist transformation. The result was a pitiful fiasco. The "socialist experiment" and the formation of the world socialist system after the war went successfully ahead, and the new nations of the world set out on the road to socialism. Socialism set an example to the rest of the world; it showed how progressive changes could be made. It means rapid industrial, social and cultural progress for the countries which had shaken off colonial and national oppression.

Under these conditions vulgar "criticism" of socialism gradually began to lose ground. It was replaced by a new tactical approach in

propaganda aimed at internally disrupting the world anti-colonial front and the socialist community by demoralising the population of socialist countries, inducing centrifugal tendencies, thereby making it "easy" to implement the imperialist policy of provocation and aggression, directed against the individual socialist countries.

This change has been most drastic in the kind of propaganda served up by the bourgeois radio. Broadcasts aimed at the Soviet Union and other socialist countries include a vast number of educational, scientific, sport and musical programmes. Bourgeois propagandists want to interest the listener and make him believe that imperialists are not pursuing a policy of provocation and aggression against the socialist countries. It is for this reason that they have given preponderance to these programmes during transmission times.

At the same time, bourgeois propaganda likes to play upon the dogmatic, "Left-wing" sectarian and nationalist tendencies which have developed in some isolated sections of the international communist movement. Bourgeois propaganda seizes any anti-Soviet statements and uses them to undermine the principles of internationalism and widen the split in the international communist movement.

Both Right and "Left-wing" opportunism always provides firm ground for bourgeois ideology to bring greater pressure to bear on the international communist movement. "Left-verbiage" and the hot air of emotive, unrealistic slogans have always provided and are providing bourgeois propaganda with plenty of room for speculation and material to undermine the

influence of Marxism-Leninism among the masses.

Bourgeois propagandists declare Marxist-Leninist ideology "obsolete" and "artificial" and appeal to everyone to realise its inefficacy. Marxist-Leninist ideology is faced with a host of anti-communist opponents of whom Rossiter, Brzezinski, Boehnski, Wetter, Blakeley and Mayer are just a few. What is the explanation for their systematic onslaughts? What really bothers the anti-communists is that they justifiably see Marxist-Leninist ideology as the force cementing the socialist countries together and rallying the people round the Communist and Workers' Parties.

In the rejection of Marxist-Leninist ideology, modern anti-communism sees the most important prerequisite for implementing the "bridging" tactics. Interpreting Johnson's tactics, Dean Rusk, the U.S. Secretary of State, formulated a concrete "general policy" towards international communism in his report on trade relations with socialist countries which he presented to Congress in February 1966. He stated that the U.S.A. would make every effort to hamper the activity of revolutionary forces today and would do all in its power to make this activity costly, dangerous and ineffective. Moreover, Dean Rusk called for furthering "the evolution inside the communist camp" in the direction of the so-called "open society". Here he means the use of trade relations, tourism, cultural exchange, propaganda and other methods for sapping the strength of the socialist community.

Anti-communism demands the "liberalisation" of socialism. By the "liberalisation" of social-

ism they do not mean the logical development of socialist democracy guided by the Communist and Workers' Parties, which will lead to the strengthening of the workers' political positions and the flourishing of socialist culture. They mean weakening the power of the workers and social relations in socialist countries.

Typical in this respect is the way bourgeois propagandists interpreted the economic reforms which have been implemented in the socialist countries over the last few years. For instance, Constantin Zarneko, once France Presse correspondent in Moscow, alleged in his article, "The Twilight of Marxism" published in a 1965 issue of *Réalité*, that Soviet man "is losing faith" in the communist system. The decisions of the 23rd Party Congress, and also those of the plenary sessions of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union after the 23rd Congress, which were received by the whole Soviet people with understanding and approval vividly showed that there can be no question of the Soviet people's loss of faith in socialism and communism. On the contrary, the economic changes in socialist countries are creating real prerequisites for a more successful approach to the building of communism. Hence the reason for bourgeois propagandists' disappointment, expressed in particular by Norman Bailey, an American contributor to the *Magazine of Wall Street and Business Analyst*. He alleged that in the Soviet Union today no one even thinks about speaking of the "chief reform", namely the return to private ownership of the means of production. Bourgeois ideologists' hopes for a spontaneous economic evolution of the socialist countries towards capital-

ism are utopian and voluntaristic, for once socialist society has stamped out the exploiting classes there are no social forces left to restore the capitalist order.

Bourgeois ideologists aim this kind of propaganda at individuals, who are to a greater or lesser extent subject to the influence of old world ideology (lower middle class attitudes, the influence of religion, etc.) or who lack adequate political experience in the class struggle. Therefore, it is with good reason that the institutions of bourgeois intelligence services to their propagandists generally contain recommendations to orientate their brainwashing machine in the direction of young people, intellectuals and people infected with petty-bourgeois and religious prejudices.

Realising perfectly well that a "frontal propaganda attack" on these sections will only bounce back, anti-communists today make wide use of the ideas of reformists and various kinds of outcasts from the working-class movement.

The so-called *Socialist Programme for the Eastern Countries of Central Europe*, published in 1963 and republished in 1965, is a typical document. Its foreword was written by Sture Erikson, the general secretary of the International Union of Socialist Youth. The programme proposes introducing "samples of the freedom machine", characteristic of capitalist countries, into socialist countries; it recommends that these countries abolish the organs of state security, dismiss the frontier troops, "use the experience" of the counter-revolutionary putsch in Hungary, etc. Statements by Georges Maleville, the French reformist, contain recommendations to abolish punishments for economic

crimes and comrades' courts in the U.S.S.R., to support opposition to communist construction and in general to wreck socialist democracy.

Anti-communism today actively propagandises the ideas of the so-called "religious Renaissance" disguised as "liberalisation" of spiritual life in socialist countries. The religious, mythical and flagrant idealistic works by the Russian philosophers Vladimir Solovyov, Berdyayev and Shestov were published and widely propagated in the West after the war. As is generally known, freedom of conscience of all citizens exists in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Their peoples freely accepted the scientific outlook and philosophy of dialectical and historical materialism whose truth is confirmed by the whole course of social practice. During the revolutionary struggle and the cultural revolution, the religious outlook lost its former position and gradually began to die out. Through propaganda today's generation of anti-communist ideologists seeks to foist a new religious outlook on the peoples of socialist countries and to prove that the "rebirth" of the human personality will only come through religion, remaining silent about the fact that a religious outlook tends to pervert science, retard social progress and suppress freedom of reason.

The fashionable slogan of "liberalisation" is thus used as a cover-up for well-planned ideological manoeuvres to wreck the social and cultural achievements scored by the peoples of socialist countries. Modern anti-communist arguments concerning "freedom" and "liberalism" are subtly loaded with hatred and intolerance

to the social and spiritual way of life in socialist countries and for the system which uprooted the exploitation of man by man, ensured the rapid economic, social and scientific progress of society and created the prerequisites for real freedom—the freedom from private ownership of the means of production and from the social, national and spiritual enslavement that was part and parcel of it.

Anti-communism as a System of Education

While bourgeois philosophical and sociological literature seeks to prove that in capitalist countries spiritual life is "free" from "set" ideological goals, special courses on anti-communism are being introduced more and more widely into the curriculum of the rising generation. Beginning with their earliest school days, young people in capitalist countries are educated in the spirit of reactionary ideological doctrines. In the U.S.A. anti-communist education accompanies every person from childhood to old age.

First in Florida in 1961 and later, following Florida's example, in a number of other American states, legislation was enacted to introduce subjects on anti-communism in secondary schools. Representatives from the CIA and FBI took part in drawing up the syllabus. Young Americans are indoctrinated to the idea that all communists are "bad people" and that the U.S.A. has the best social system. A conservative political outlook is inculcated by playing on emotions and bombarding the minds of the young generation with the chauvinist ideas of Americanism. It is proved that by virtue of its exclusiveness, Americanism is alien to communism. Attempts are being made to turn anti-

communism into a fixation so that the word "communism" itself produces a negative reaction. The notion that communism is hostile to every American and the whole country is widely propagated.

Any Soviet citizen for the first time in the U.S.A. is stunned by the posters and slogans confronting him at every turn on aerodromes, by the road side and in the underground appealing to people to rise up in arms and stand firm in the battle with communism. Boisterous drum-beating parades along New York's Fifth Avenue convince the idlers that real Americans are briskly marching in their columns. There has been a feverish move to establish "American traditions" vaunting the existing political order's "firmness" and "stability". The philistine's vocabulary is littered with such clichés as "We are a free country" or "Democracy in action". Obscurantists such as McCarthy and Goldwater have paid voluble lip service to these clichés in the past.

Where is American free criticism, devoid of blind acceptance of political phrase-mongering, where is the common sense and realism of Americans the political acrobats so often speak about? American communists possess these qualities but they are silenced behind bars. Their spirit is alive in some American universities, but even there the venom of anti-communism is as virulent as anywhere. In the major American universities such as Columbia, Harvard and California special Russian institutes have been founded, all tainted with an open anti-communist spirit. The University of Columbia has a special institute of communist affairs headed by the rabid anti-communist Zbigniew

Brzezinski. At New York University a staff of anti-communists is coached by Sidney Hook. All social science departments in American universities are in the grip of anti-communist polemics. In the forefront of this is Clinton Rossiter who alleged in his book entitled *Marxism: The View from America* that dialectical materialism was rubbish.

Why set up special institutes, introduce courses everywhere and write a mass of books and articles to "refute" "rubbish"? The answer is not clear. The U.S.A.'s paradox is that in their attempts to uproot "communism at home", American anti-communists have bricked up a huge internal wall to shield the country from the "communist threat". This circumstance apparently proves that communism is not alien to the "American way of life".

There was a time when Senator McCarthy proclaimed that not only American universities, but the state apparatus and army were liable to "communist infiltration". When McCarthy died his allegation was occasionally held up to ridicule but "just in case", a number of measures were taken to stave off "communist infiltration" into the state apparatus. Back in 1962, the American government organised a special anti-communist school which trains from 300 to 480 civil servants annually.

Big business magnates are also highly perturbed about the "morale" of their employees. For their education they take advantage of the services of the anti-communist organisation called National Education Program, operating in Searcy (Arkansas) and headed by Doctor Benson, a fascist supporter. Apart from its lecture-halls, the organisation has its own press

which turns out mass anti-communist literature, and is in the good books of American monopolies, Republic Steel Corporation, U.S. Steel Corporation, Gulf Oil Corporation, Olin Mathieson Chemical, AICOA and other corporations have inflated its funds by 13 million dollars over the past five years.

The spirit of anti-communism, pervading the American educational system from top to bottom, paves an easy way for ultra Right and neofascist infiltration. Ultra Right elements set up their own schools aimed at forming a hard core of anti-communist fanatics. A group of American sociologists—Raymond Wolfinger and Sheila Rosenchak, Professors at Stanford University, Kenneth Previt, Professor at Washington University, and others—analysed the results of a survey conducted among students at an anti-communist school in Oakland (California) set up by the Christian Anti-communist Crusade. Of the 650 students at the school 308 were questioned. The most fanatic remainder refused to answer the questionnaire. To the question: "Do you consider communism a very great internal danger?" 66 per cent of those asked gave an affirmative answer; 91 per cent believed that American colleges and universities were hotbeds of communist ideas and 48 per cent were in favour of a war with the Soviet Union.

It is obvious that ultra Right-wing elements psychologically train American youth to rise up against free-thinking, liberalism and democracy at home and to support the American imperialist policy abroad.

It is difficult to overestimate the danger of bringing up young people in the spirit of fanaticism and aggression. Politically inexperienced

young people, who have not known the horror of the Second World War, who are constantly subject to the influence of sadistic and sex films and who are "free" from all moral principles, are obedient tools in the hands of reckless, ultra Right-wing circles propagating a reactionary political outlook.

Imperialist home and foreign policy bulldozes through anything that stands in the way of turning the young people of capitalist countries into violent fanatics and amoral cynics prepared for extreme gambles. In which direction will the American ship of state move if ultra Right-wing neofascist adventurers take the helm? This question has made many Americans put their thinking-caps on, and is haunting all sober-minded people in other capitalist countries in view of the growing neofascist threat.

4. THE FUTILE "CRUSADE"

The "Self-criticism" of Anti-communism

The ultra Right wing of anti-communism today is planning a "radical operation" to uproot communism in all corners of the world. Robert Hutchins, an American pedagogue and president of Fund for the Republic, analyzing the aims and ideas of ultra Right-wing circles, wrote in an article published on February 14, 1966, in the *Newark Star-edger* that, as a result of many years of anti-communist propaganda in the U.S.A. there had sprung up numerous political groups under the slogan: "Wherever communism raises its head, our duty is to cut it off". At the same time Robert Hutchins asks himself the question: how realistic are political aims of that kind which are determining the foreign policy of American imperialism to an ever greater extent.

Some anti-communists see this "decapitation" policy as justified only under full guarantee that the executioner's own head is safe on his shoulders. The ultra Right are willing to give various verbal guarantees on that score assuring that the U.S.A.'s military power ensures full freedom of action and that the real problem is only to what extent the measures to be taken are effective and vigorous. The anti-communist

ultra Right wing brings heavy political pressure to bear on the administrative apparatus of imperialist countries, demanding that decisions be adopted to show that imperialism is fighting an all-out anti-communist "crusade." This pressure has been considerably increased in recent years especially in connection with the Vietnam war conducted under the flag of a "crusade" against communism. The American government asserts that Vietnam is only a small military beachhead where it has challenged all the forces of international communism.

However, this ideological smoke-screen does not prevent us from seeing that American imperialism intends to gain the sympathies of all imperialist forces in the world today and to win effective military and political support. In actual fact, American imperialism is primarily pursuing its own interests in Vietnam, striving to secure a firm foothold in South-East Asia and to turn this region into its own economic and political handmaiden. The anti-communist slogan was needed to break the Geneva agreements on Vietnam, the principles of the UN and even the legal basis of the American Constitution.

However, ideological slogans have their own "logic" and, to a certain extent, exert their own pressure. To the anti-communist ultra Right wing, struggle for "limited" aims seems an "inconsistency" as does the use of inadequate means to attain the final aim. The anti-communist ultra Right wing sets great store by "victory" in Vietnam, viewing it as proof of its general claim that communism on our planet is a "temporal" socio-political phenomenon, a kind of "fortuitous event", a "mistake" in world his-

tory which must be "corrected" as soon as possible. Hitler had a similar brain-child when he intended to set up the "millennial kingdom" of fascism throughout the world.

The anti-communist ultra Right wing views and evaluates historical events from the point of view of the "titanic work" carried out after the Second World War by reactionary imperialist forces, and, first and foremost, by U.S. imperialism, to build a powerful military machine, to set up military and political outposts in various parts of the world, to reinstate neofascist organisations and to brainwash the masses in capitalist countries. It believes that all the groundwork has been done for launching the grandiose anti-communist "crusade". It thought that the U.S. imperialists' victory in Vietnam would be quick and easy, and that the communist movement was under heavy stress as a result of the splitting activities of the Chinese Communist Party leadership. However, hopes for a lightning victory had to be abandoned as the prospect of defeat loomed larger and larger. This apparently isolated instance, in effect, poses the crucial question of how practical, realistic and expedient the "global way of thinking" is. Is not the main premise of the anti-communist policy—that communism and modern revolutionary movements are the product of an "international conspiracy" which "can be smashed" with the help of a number of "effective" preventive political measures—utopian and voluntaristic?

In the bourgeois ideological camp itself, critical voices began to be heard querying the "global way of thinking" and "uncompromising anti-communism". In 1964 a book entitled *The*

Utile Crusade. Anticommunism as an American Credo by S. Lens, the reputed publicist, was published in the U.S.A. The book's very title is only too typical. Lens comes to the conclusion that the idea of wiping out communism on earth is a pipe dream. Anti-communism's inflexible policy, the support of the most reactionary political regimes and the "principle of force" as the primary principle of home and foreign policy are unrealistic and make an incorrect assessment of the social shift in world history. Modern anti-communism assesses its policy from the point of view of historical experience of the past, when capitalism was the dominant political force, and when a well-oiled military machine was enough to attain the goals which imperialism had mapped out to build its colonial empires and suppress the people's revolutionary movements.

The socialist world today has a sufficient military and political potential to neutralise imperialist militarism. Any flagrantly militarist policy is thus reckless and jeopardises whole peoples and states.

If we take the same gauge to evaluate the aggression in Vietnam, the aggression which imperialist ideologists present as a practical beginning to the "crusade" against "international communism", we realise why many capitalist countries are in practice averse to rendering American imperialism any serious aid in this adventure. Any "aid" ultimately means that these countries are involved in wars which are contrary to their national interests.

In the post-war period, American imperialism managed to scrape together a number of military and political blocs—NATO, SEATO and

CENTO—under the flag of open opposition to the so-called “communist threat”. The setting up of these blocs went hand in hand with a blazing propaganda campaign, the gist of which was that in the mid-20th century it was necessary to limit the principles of national sovereignty and to a certain extent sacrifice national independence in the name of the struggle against “aggressive” international communism. After the end of the Second World War over 20 years have passed—not a brief historical period if we bear in mind the rapid rate of historical development in the 20th century. What do we learn from it?

It has been proved how unfounded the myth about the “aggressiveness” of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries is. This, however, throws into relief the *real* aim behind the “anti-communist threat” policy. The myth of “communist aggression” has been an ideological cover-up for U.S. imperialist infiltration into the economy and political life of European, Asian, African and Latin American countries. American imperialism diffused this myth in order to assert its economic and political hegemony over other capitalist countries. It is enough to say that between 1958 and 1964, U.S. capital investments in the economy of the Common Market countries increased annually by approximately 20 per cent. In 1958 the U.S.A. invested \$1,907 million in the economy of the Common Market countries and in 1964 the figure reached \$5,398 million. At present 37 per cent of the investments go to West Germany, 27 per cent to France, 16 per cent to Italy, 11 per cent to Holland and 9 per cent to Belgium and Luxembourg. These are facts.

The leaders of these capitalist countries are now faced with the question: “Do we accept the myth of communist ‘aggressiveness’ or do we look at the facts soberly and re-evaluate the principles of our former policy?” This is a vital question in view of the fact that American imperialism, like Shylock, is beginning to demand its “pound of flesh” from other capitalist countries and requires their immediate participation in acts of military aggression to help the U.S.A. in its role of world gendarme. Now many capitalist countries are faced with the real problem of freedom, and not a mythical one—freedom from the economic and political dominance of American imperialism. Step by step the so-called “free world”, which bourgeois propaganda has been triumphantly putting over for so long like an advertisement, has turned out to be nothing but a well-planned and well-implemented system of economic and political oppression, the system of American hegemony.

When President de Gaulle declared the national independence of France and reassessed French policy in view of U.S. economic infiltration into Europe, there was immediate talk in some European capitalist countries of the “retrogression” of the French political attitude, the “backwardness” of de Gaulle’s political views and their incompatibility with the “new spirit” of political life in the second half of the 20th century. However, the question that should really be asked is: “Are not in fact the attitudes of those who allowed themselves to be duped by the myth of ‘communist aggression’, limited their national independence and still abide by this myopically, truly retrograde?”

U.S. imperialist ideologists grimly cling on to their myth of the "threat of communist aggression" in Europe in order to preserve the economic and political dependence of European capitalist countries and maintain American hegemony in the bourgeois world. With this aim in mind, they propagandise the idea that national sovereignty in today's world is unacceptable. For instance, in his speech on March 23, 1966, at the Foreign Service Institute of the Department of State, President Johnson outspokenly alleged that "every advance in the technology of war makes more unacceptable the old and narrow concepts of sovereignty". Thereby he let us right into the real political reasons for the existence of military blocs set up under the U.S. aegis. In this situation, there naturally arises the necessity to get rid of the burden of American imperialism and to secure guarantees for the independence and political stability of the individual European states. This stability can be guaranteed by the policy of peace and peaceful co-existence between states with differing social systems which is firmly and consistently pursued by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The West is gradually beginning to realise this, including the most diehard opponents of the Soviet Union's foreign policy. At the Congress of the CDU in Bonn on March 21, 1966, Konrad Adenauer, the former West German Chancellor, noted the Soviet Union's mediation, for instance, in the military conflict between India and Pakistan as a major symbolic event not fully understood by many. The Soviet Union, stated Adenauer, is a country which wants peace. This recognition once again shows how un-

sound the ideological platform is under the feet of the aggressive, anti-communist, military NATO bloc.

The ideology of "global anti-communism", aimed at exporting counter-revolution, engineering ideological subversion and flouting the independence and national sovereignty of individual countries, contradicts the interests of peace and democracy. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries are now a major political and socio-economic force in modern international life, and the widest sections of the population in capitalist countries have long since realised this. The people at large bring political pressure to bear on bourgeois governments demanding the establishment of friendly relations with the Soviet Union. It is with good reason that bourgeois parties, with their sights on political leadership, are often forced to include clauses on the improvement of relations with socialist countries in their pre-election programmes in order to try to swing the vote in their favour. Pressure from the masses to achieve this is constantly increasing as the intolerable burden of the arms race and aggressive policy closely bound up with anti-communist ideology weighs more and more heavily. The post-war economic boom, which allowed a certain raising of the standard of living among some sections of the working class in capitalist countries, gave rise to the idea of the "welfare state". The existence of a standing army of unemployed, regions of poverty and misery, slums in towns, workers' meagre political rights and educational and cultural backwardness have all been passed off as "temporary factors" which will gradually be removed as the "welfare state" triumphantly advances. However,

reality is disappointing the masses more and more. In an atmosphere of soaring technological progress and rapid development of productive forces, larger and larger sums of money are being spent on armaments and aggression. In the U.S.A. financial cuts are being made in the war against poverty. Bourgeois ideologists occasionally maintain with false optimism that the capitalist system can pursue the policy of "both guns and butter". But in reality the growth of inflationary tendencies, the "wage freeze" policy and the emergence of serious financial difficulties resulting from cuts in U.S. gold reserves are all showing up these illusions for what they are.

The economic reasons behind the war in Vietnam are becoming more and more apparent. One progressive economist has pointed out that, in practice, the war has in many respects the same effect on capitalism as an economic crisis. As we know, in the 30s the fascist states with their capitalist system of economic development underwent stable economic growth, whereas other capitalist countries were stricken with an economic slump. This "break" in the economic cycle was in fact fictitious. The fascist states went ahead with the arms race and aggressive action during which both "surplus" products and people were "consumed". At present the arms race and aggression have been brought into play to "stimulate" the drive for the American economy's "stability" and "full employment".

The policy of imperialism today, based on the ideology of "global anti-communism", is betraying deep-rooted contradictions. On the one hand, it aggravates international tension and increases the danger of thermonuclear war, while on the

other, it creates more and more difficulties within the capitalist countries. It shows up the basic contradiction between the aims of uncompromising militarist anti-communism and the means of attaining them. Imperialism cannot put history into reverse, yet it continues to press energetically ahead to put its own ideals into practice. Imperialist ideologists' fanaticism blinds their reason and forces them to search feverishly for a "magic ring" which, as in the fairy-tale, might help them to put their pipe dreams into practice. If only they realised there is no such thing as a "magic ring". Their recourse to military violence and suppression of revolutionary, anti-imperialist liberation movements does not pay.

When the Americans began their major military operation in Vietnam, they launched a vast propaganda campaign to discredit the French army's military efficiency. Its aim was to prove that the French defeat was entirely attributable to the weakness of the French army. They began to release films and publish articles showing how, after the Second World War, the French suffered one defeat after another in their former Asian and African colonies. The defeats were explained by the inner weaknesses of the French army, its incapacity and the general enfeeblement of France after the Second World War. American propaganda proceeds from the assumption that the 20th century is the century of America and that Europe has become too senile to solve the serious political problems which only the "young" and "energetic" American imperialist predator is capable of. It was then that a second thesis was added to the first, that the war in Vietnam could be won only if it were waged "in the American way".

Blind faith in the power of "Americanism", this ideological myth, has pushed U.S. reactionary circles into embarking on aggressive and adventurous action of an extreme kind. It has prevented a correct assessment of the French army's defeat in Vietnam. The Americans have viewed and assessed the situation in Vietnam only from a military point of view; they have only evaluated the army's fire and manpower, without taking into account the *political content* of the war in Vietnam.

The root of the French army's defeat was not in its weakness and lack of numbers, but in the fact that it was waging a war which it could not win. In many respects the French army was much better prepared for waging military operations in Vietnam than its American counterpart. The Americans self-confidently invaded a country which they little knew. The long-standing colonial hegemony of France in Indochina had after all given them an expert knowledge of local conditions, traditions, the people's psychology and language. Yet the French were defeated. It was not simply a military defeat, but a defeat of *colonial* wars themselves as a result of the historical conditions of today.

From the very first day of their aggression in Vietnam, the Americans have tried to maintain that theirs is a "special" war unlike the colonial war waged by the French. They began bombing the Democratic Republic of Vietnam to convince the world that the U.S.A. opposes "global communist aggression" and that in Vietnam they are solving the problems besetting the whole imperialist camp. However, everyone is only too well aware that it was the U.S.A. which unleashed its aggressive war against a socialist country; the

Democratic Republic of Vietnam never attacked the U.S.A. One more thing is obvious: despite its attempts to make out that aggression in Vietnam is "calling a halt to international communism", U.S. imperialism is pursuing its own narrow selfish interests, striving to secure a firm economic and political foothold in South-East Asia, step into France's shoes and push England out. This does much to explain why the U.S.A. is not actively supported militarily by other imperialist states although it uses the whole gamut of economic and political pressure and psychological blackmail to bring this about. It is forced to build up its own military forces in Vietnam and raise the allocation of funds to the limit. It is no use trying to hide the fact that the South Vietnamese puppets do not represent the South Vietnamese people; they are political tools in the hands of U.S. imperialists. Thus, under the slogan of anti-communism the most commonplace colonial war is being waged. That is why American aggression in Vietnam is also being conducted according to the laws of colonial war.

First, the Americans have had to renounce their hopes for a "blitzkrieg" and lightning victory although they massed huge numbers of troops and armaments in Vietnam. *Second*, in as far as it is not a matter of inflicting military defeat on the enemy's army, but of *enslaving the people*, military operations in Vietnam have turned out to be a war waged by the American army allied by politically unstable puppet troops against the Vietnamese people. Because of this the front, in the strict military meaning of the word, has no distinct geographical boundaries in Vietnam: this front covers the whole country. *Third*, along with the build-up of armed forces in Vietnam,

the Americans are forced to introduce political measures to turn South Vietnam into one huge concentration camp.

The failures of American troops in Vietnam drives them to acts akin to genocide. The Americans are using chemical weed-killers and poisonous gases, napalm and phosphorus. They burn villages to the ground and savagely torture the Vietnamese people. In this way, the war against communism amounts to the barbarous extermination of a people.

A Reassessment of Tactics?

The tactical line followed by American bourgeois propaganda after the war was directed towards creating a new image of the U.S.A. as a country ruled by the principles of "democracy" and "freedom" and one that defends the "free world" from the "aggressive encroachments of communism". Every means bourgeois propaganda could summon was directed towards this end, creating widespread illusions.

In recent years real imperialist policy has crystallised more and more clearly. It is now aimed at preparing a counter-offensive against the forces of democracy and freedom, the forces of peace, social progress and socialism, though this was once hidden behind a smoke-screen of illusions, spread by bourgeois propaganda. The paradox of this propaganda is that it is the victim of its own illusions.

"Freedom" and "democracy"—the working terms used by the bourgeois propaganda machine—cannot fail but penetrate the consciousness of the widest sections of the population. The people assess the real political actions of governments in terms which they are used to. The people believe in the principles of freedom and de-

mocracy. American imperialist policy goes right against these principles. The widest sections of the population in capitalist countries are grasping more and more clearly that anti-communist policy is incompatible with the policy of defending freedom.

Within its own narrow limits, illusory bourgeois consciousness has bred a deep inner contradiction which psychologically brought about the birth of the so-called "new left movement". The "new left movement" in the U.S.A. has a motley crowd of supporters, but all its representatives are agreed on one point—their demand for "freedom" and "democracy" in general and their protest against American imperialism's aggressive policy in Vietnam. The trend of public opinion in the U.S.A. has been systematically gauged and shows that the wave of opposition to imperialist policy is becoming increasingly difficult to deal with. Opposition to American imperialism's home and foreign policy is occasionally so strongly felt by some individuals that it takes the form of burning themselves publicly. Liberal opposition protests against the government's increasing repression of those in favour of putting an end to military operations in Vietnam and a just representation of the events taking place in the country.

A similar contradiction between the principles of freedom and the real policy of American imperialism is also emerging inside the international bloc of capitalist countries. The bourgeois countries which had formed a political alliance with U.S. imperialism were soon covered with a broad network of foreign military bases. An organisational infrastructure had been created—the hidden

inner machine of the American empire holding huge territories in its grip.

In bourgeois countries the universal opposition movement to U.S. imperialism is gaining momentum. Demands for independence are being heard more and more frequently from England, Italy, Turkey and other countries. The Latin American countries are actually in the throes of a revolutionary movement. The anti-colonial struggle is sweeping the African continent.

Under these conditions American bourgeois propaganda is faced with the problem of reassessing its tactics, of bringing them into line with real political practice.

American imperialism is now showing a greater tendency to place its bet not on the so-called "free world" as a whole, but on the countries which, in its view, are militantly anti-communist. On the basis of this, the scene is now set for the marriage of West-German revanchists to American militarism inside the Western bloc. Anti-communism is becoming the banner under which darkest reaction and the most flagrantly aggressive, militarist forces of today are rallying. But anti-communism stands on social ground which is gradually being knocked away from under its feet.

The logic of anti-communism inevitably leads to political isolationism. In the U.S.A. isolationism traditionally carried considerable weight. U.S. imperialism, trying to assert its hegemony on the American continent, adhered closely to the principles of the Monroe Doctrine. At the present time American isolationism is becoming not so much a geographical as a political concept, as the influence of ultra Right ideology is leaving its imprint on it. American Right-wing circles, in parti-

cular the Birchists, are pressing for the U.S.A.'s withdrawal from the U.N. and other international organisations, asserting that their principles are "Left-wing" and pro-communist. They want to depend on the U.S.A.'s military power and on open violence to carry out international policy. This is the kind of policy which ultra Right-wing circles recognise as "realistic" and free from "illusions" and "liberal demagogy".

Although American militarist bosses are trying to knock together a wide anti-communist bloc, the course of historical events and the crisis of anti-communism is forcing them to orientate themselves, in practical policy, towards narrower reactionary alliances. The U.S. government renders military "aid" first and foremost to the states which, to a sufficient extent, clearly express their anti-communist tendencies.

The U.S. government holds a cynical view of the soldiers of anti-communist foreign states as cheap "cannon fodder". Robert McNamara, former U.S. Secretary of Defence, calculated that the provision and upkeep of one soldier in the armies of the countries dependent on the U.S.A. is practically nine times cheaper than the upkeep of one American soldier.

The ideological aims of anti-communism, pursued by the U.S. government, clash with the interests of bourgeois governments in a whole number of capitalist states averse to involvement in U.S. military adventures. On the basis of this, there has been a reassessment of some aspects of anti-communism in these countries. There has been a move to bring the national interests of the country into the foreground and to alter the ideology of anti-communism to suit this. The ideological precepts of anti-communism

are gradually being tied down to the national interests of bourgeois governments under the pressure of historical circumstances. Symptomatic in this respect are the works entitled *Nouvelles Leçons sur les Sociétés Industrielles* (1964) and *Esquisse d'une Théorie des Régimes Politiques* (1965) by Raymond Aron, the French bourgeois sociologist. In these works he tries to prove that the social structure of the Soviet Union and some other socialist countries has been formed as a result of a definite type of "industrial society" and that, therefore, it possesses features common to industrial society in the capitalist West. The accent on the level of industrial development and attempts to unearth "similarities" between socialist and capitalist countries, although these arguments hold no water, at least reflect some changes in the way bourgeois ideologists think. They show that these ideologists are seeking theoretical grounds for establishing closer economic, scientific, technical and political contacts with the socialist countries, contacts which comply with the national interests of the country concerned.

One cannot help but notice that, although they were forced into this position, they still come up with various kinds of provisos and attempts to squeeze "concessions" out of the socialist countries, in particular ideological ones. Aron "proves" that the socialist countries must "renounce" Marxist-Leninist ideology as an "artificial structure" which is supposedly "incompatible" with today's phase of industrial progress. Aron's position holds no water because Marxist-Leninist ideology is the social science which reflects the laws of historical development and, on the basis of this, sets up definite goals of social practice

for progressive classes and social strata. This is the fundamental difference between it and the ideological precepts of anti-communism which express the adventurist aims of reactionary groups. These aims contradict both historical progress and social science. In this sense, the ideological precepts of anti-communism are really an artificial structure which, as the facts show, history repudiates.

INSTEAD OF A CONCLUSION

Certain essays and articles with talk of the crisis which has hit "Western political consciousness" have recently begun to appear in the press of some bourgeois countries. As a rule they put their finger on U.S. aggression in Vietnam as the chief reason for this crisis. People are gradually realising that U.S. escalation of aggression in Vietnam is seriously threatening to involve the capitalist countries dependent on the U.S.A. in the war. Already under way is a certain reassessment of U.S. imperialism as the ideological and political leader of the bourgeois world. The bourgeois West is now pressed with the need to break with the forms of political thought it is used to.

The principles of thought in leading bourgeois circles were formed as a reflection of imperialist policy in the 20th century. The major historical landmarks of this policy were the First and Second World wars. Both wars were gradually prepared and both consciously followed definite aims. According to the plans of imperialist statesmen, the First World War was to lead to the division of the world according to the new relation of forces in the international arena. But as we know, it led to an "unexpected" result—the emergence of the Soviet Union, the first socialist country. This result was not "planned"

by imperialist politicians and they regarded it as "blind fortune", as a kind of "historical error".

The Second World War unleashed by the nazis pursued a complex of two ideas—a "correction" of this "historical error", i.e., the destruction of socialism and a new redistribution of the world, or more precisely, the establishment of a world hegemony of fascism. The outcome of the Second World War need hardly be mentioned: it spelt out the military and political collapse of fascism, the emergence of the socialist states and the beginning of the end of the imperialist colonial system. However, the Second World War did not lead to a complete break-away from the primary principles of political thought by which bourgeois ideologists were guided. After the Second World War "global" anti-communism, formulated principally by American imperialist ideologists, gradually became the pivot of their ideological precepts.

By inertia bourgeois ideologists consider the only "realistic" policy that which takes into account the military potential of a capitalist Power and the degree to which it can be deployed to achieve imperialist goals. They view the ideas of peace, freedom, democracy, justice and international law as a convenient screen for shielding the real political machine from the eye of public opinion. This policy is aimed at altering the relation of forces in the international arena, and then, at the right moment, throwing off the screen and beginning a conversation in the language of "real policy".

The ideology of "global" anti-communism mirrors imperialist intentions to alter the existing frontiers in the world, to interfere in the internal

affairs of other states, to limit and factually demolish their national sovereignty and to unleash aggressive actions against socialist countries which have embarked on the road of independent national development. It is not by chance that notions of the "special mission" of American imperialism in the 20th century, of the fact that the U.S.A. is a Pacific and Atlantic Power whose interests are global, are widespread in the U.S.A. Ideas of the "special role" and "messianism" in any imperialist country are and always were ideological camouflage for aggression. U.S. leaders have recently begun to talk about the ideas of hegemony and Americanism in a particularly blatant form in their speeches. Does this mean that the screen, behind which the real aims of U.S. imperialism were hiding, has begun to collapse? They are apparently now waiting for the so-called "convenient moment" when they will start implementing "real policy". Aggression in the Congo, the Dominican Republic and the U.S.A.'s barbarous war in Vietnam are all links in this political chain. "Global" anti-communism is showing its true colours.

Anti-communist ideology was in its way an intellectual prerequisite for the inhuman, cynical way in which modern imperialist propagandists think. Under the banner of "realistically" viewing history they consider war a permanent part of public life, supposedly stemming from man's nature. This militarisation of public psychology and thought has led to the fact that the recognition of the inevitability of war is now the leitmotiv not only of theoretical researches intended for a comparatively narrow circle of readers, but also of the mass media—the press, radio and television. It is typical that the American press, in-

cluding such "respectable" newspapers as the *New York Times*, assures the reader that the use of poisonous gases and chemical weed-killers in war can be "more humane" than the use of more usual methods of waging war as they take a lighter toll, examines their "usefulness" and "effectiveness" and makes a mockery of the "ignorance" of world public opinion "incapable" of distinguishing lethal gases from harmless ones.

However, the "mechanised brain" of the imperialist war is, not of its own choice, running up against the problems and riddles of social life which it is incapable of solving in any satisfactory way. The major problem is the economic and defensive power of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The idea of establishing a "new world order", which seemed easily feasible when the U.S.A. had the monopoly of nuclear weapons, became much more doubtful after the Soviet nuclear tests. The first Soviet sputnik launched in 1957 put paid to the myth of U.S. "invulnerability" by virtue of America's geographical position. At present, discussion of setting up a defence system against a retaliatory blow has brought even U.S. military leaders to the conclusion that a nuclear attack by the U.S.A. would not go unpunished. Appeals to "wipe out" communism "globally" now sound essentially like appeals to commit suicide.

In the last few years arguments as to the "power of ideas" have more and more frequently begun to slip into speeches by anti-communists, a fact by no means characteristic of them in the past. Apparently there is another power apart from that of lethal weapons. However, even in this field, in the sphere of ideas, anti-communism shows up its bankruptcy. In essence a deeply

reactionary ideology violently opposing modern revolutionary changes in the world, anti-communism is forced to create an air of "respectable" conservatism round its political philosophy and to juggle with such concepts as "freedom" and "democracy". But as soon as it makes the move from words to deeds its mask of "respectability" at once falls off and the peoples of the world are faced by the ominous grimace of an aggressor and tyrant. It was this grimace which all honourable people saw when U.S. imperialism unleashed its barbarous aggression in South-East Asia. The mounting flood of anti-war literature in the U.S.A. and everywhere else and attempts to re-interpret the philosophy of militarism and violence are directly attributable to this.

In the U.S.A., as Herbert Aptheker, the American Marxist, writes, the unprecedented "campus rebellion" is under way. It makes a general demand for the "humanisation of scholarship", flouts democratic liberal ideas at variance with the official ones and breaks with reaction and neoconservatism.¹ In essence, an ideological contradiction has sprung up between this literature and the official "factories of thought", which are required to supply the state organisations, waging the "psychological war" with the necessary material. The fundamental weakness of the imperialist "psychological war" industry is that it is incapable of manufacturing positive ideals in line with the people's interests.

The emergence of this hypertrophied "psychological war" industry is something comparatively new-fangled which imperialism has come up with in the last few decades. This industry is the

modern form of imperialist ideology, required to "twist" the masses' minds. It covers the special anti-communist research institutes and their staff, the schools turning out this staff, the printing houses producing anti-communist literature, radio and television, various subversive organisations and the funds supporting anti-communist organisations. Modern imperialist ideology is not only a doctrine but a Leviathan of "psychological war".

This means that it has direct organisational contacts with the institutions of the imperialist state structure, which devise and implement policy in line with the interests of monopoly capital. This ensures that the "psychological war" industry "will react flexibly" at all turns in the imperialist state machine's policy. This industry is in general anti-communistically orientated and at the same time highly mobile and capable of comparatively rapidly drawing up "necessary" theoretical doctrines and widely propagandising them. Sharp turns in propaganda in line with sharp turns in imperialist policy, new forms and methods of influencing public opinion and the "psychological war" industry create the illusion that imperialist ideology is "dying out" and "is being replaced" by the "value compromise". But this is an illusion which arises on the basis of the usual idea of ideology as a doctrine, drawn up to coincide with the interests of a given class which they consciously use to arm themselves and which is therefore accepted by all members of that class. Today a new form of imperialist ideology has been born. It is characterised by its anti-communist orientation but at the same time comprises considerable variety of doctrines and concepts, which are drawn up and used for

¹ See *World Marxist Review*, October 1966, No. 10.

conditioning public opinion, depending on the historical situation. The notion of the "substitution" of ideology for "value compromise" is fundamentally misleading but reflects the change in the form of imperialist ideology. This ideology is now presented in a wide range of forms from "academic" researches to the bare-faced lies of so-called "black propaganda".

Imperialist ideology views the "psychological war" industry as a means of steering public opinion along the course it has mapped out. It is to be the master-key to the door of "victory" in the battle of ideologies. But, as the facts show, in this war, too, anti-communism is suffering one defeat after another. The people's attack on imperialism and its aggressive designs is gaining momentum throughout the world. Anti-communism is not supported to any considerable extent among the masses because no camouflage of propaganda can cover up the great progressive achievements scored by socialism and democracy.

Man is not a machine which can be made to work according to a set programme. Man thinks, analyses and compares. In the course of such a comparative analysis any honest researcher comes to the conclusion that socialism is bringing the world social progress and freedom from exploitation, imperialist wars and cultural backwardness, whereas imperialism is a threat to the human race, a stronghold of reaction, national suppression and the mainspring of aggression.

The successes scored by the Soviet Union in the 50 years since the Great October Socialist Revolution, which put our country in the forefront of social, scientific and technical progress, are a historical fact everyone today is bound to

reckon with. Even to the bourgeois political leaders, for all their myopia and averseness to facing the obvious fact that the emergence and consolidation of socialist forces is not a chance event but a result of historical necessity, it is becoming more and more understandable that a vast social shift has taken place in the world which makes the global political plans of imperialist aggressors groundless. That is why there is so much talk of the crisis of the "Western political consciousness" in the bourgeois press.

Bourgeois ideologists are faced with an agonising question "if there is to be no world war against the forces of socialism, what policy then do we pursue? How do we reconcile bourgeois political thought with the new, changed world?" On the basis of this question, individual attempts are made to devise a "new view" of socialism as a kind of "industrial society", to see "evolutionary changes" in socialism towards capitalism and to endeavour to draw up "rules" of coexistence with socialism which would make it possible to achieve imperialist goals by peaceful means. These new trends bear the seal of old aspirations and hopes and the fear of looking reality soberly in the face. Some bourgeois ideologists are cautiously beginning to accept peaceful coexistence and in so doing make definite "stipulations" for "internal changes" in socialist countries, which presuppose a weakening of the Communist and Workers' Parties and Marxist-Leninist ideology. This attitude somehow gives the peoples of socialist countries to understand that bourgeois politicians "have the right" to "demand" something from them and that for peaceful co-existence the socialist countries have to make definite "sacrifices". This uni-

lateral demand for "sacrifices" smacks of the old feudal aristocracy's snobishness, when on no account did it want to admit that all people are born with the same rights. It is difficult to estimate how much fresh air would be needed to blow away this feudal dust of which bourgeois ideologists' heads are full.

A resolution of the 23rd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on a Report by its Central Committee states: "The C.P.S.U. has always made and now makes every effort to safeguard the peaceful labour of the Soviet people; it is working actively for the maintenance of world peace and is waging a determined struggle against imperialist aggression. The U.S.S.R. is constantly rendering support to the liberation struggle of the peoples against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, and is making an increasing contribution to the fight of the working people in all countries for peace, national independence, democracy and socialism."¹

The firm and consistent policy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union aimed at easing international tension, preserving peace, averting a new world war and strengthening friendship between all peoples is unshakable and unchangeable. The Soviet people guided by the Communist Party are building and will build communist society. They will wage a relentless struggle against any aggressors who uphold the ideology of violence and suppression of freedom, equality and national independence. This policy, the only humanistic one compatible with the basic interests of freedom-loving peoples, opens up the road

to social progress in today's highly complex and contradictory historical situation. This policy is in accord with the requirements of modern history and holds out prospects for the free development of peoples in the future. It opposes the policy of "global" anti-communism, the policy of imperialist violence and aggression.

¹ *23rd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, Moscow, 1966, p. 280.

**Progress Publishers
recently
put out the following books:**

■ **FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEMS OF HISTORICAL
MATERIALISM. GROUP OF AUTHORS**

All students of philosophy and the social sciences are offered this work on historical materialism written by noted Soviet scientists. Examining the general regularities of the development of human societies from the standpoint of historical materialism the authors show that this doctrine is not a scheme or dogma or compendium of abstract propositions and principles, but an eternally living, developing theory.

Cloth 13×20 cm 336 pp.

■ **LEONTYEV L.A. SHORT COURSE IN POLITICAL
ECONOMY**

The author is a prominent Soviet economist, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences. In his book he sets forth the basic propositions of scientific Marxism on the laws governing the development of society.

Though small in size this book gives a good coverage of all sections of political economy. Theoretical problems are discussed in the context of practice.

With its lively language, wealth of factual material and wide scope the book makes interesting reading for broad sections of people in any country.

Cloth 13×20 cm 416 pp.



Imported by
IMPORTED
PUBLICATIONS, INC.
320 West Ohio Street
Chicago, Illinois 60610
Phone 312/787-9017